DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 410 HE 014 646

TITLE	Interuniversity Co-Operation in the Europe Region.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Bucharest (Romania). European Centre for Higher Education.
REPORT NO	ISBN-92-3-101941-4
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	72p.
AVAILABLE FROM	European Centre for Higher Education, UNESCO-CEPES, 39, Stirbei Voda St., R-70732, Bucharest, Romania.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperative Programs; Educational Policy; *Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; *Information Networks; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; *International Educational Exchange; International Organizations; International Relations; Questionnaires; Regional Cooperation; *Research Projects; Student Exchange Programs; Teacher Exchange Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Europe (East); *Europe (West)

ABSTRACT

Aspects and forms of interuniversity cooperation in Europe, problems and shortcomings encountered, and advantages are reviewed. Existing modalities and forms of cooperation and coordination in the following areas are considered: student exchanges, teacher exchanges, research, documentation and information, and policy and administration. A certain number of countries continue to favor informal cooperation but such cooperation is carried out in the framework of agreements from university to university (with or without governmental agreements). In some cases international bilateral or unilateral agreements become national law and can govern cooperation. Cooperation and coordination at the national level and the role of interuniversity organizations are also considered. All of the socialist countries responding to the survey indicate an intense cooperation with the other countries of the socialist community and especially with the Soviet Union. The intensity of cooperation in other countries appears also to be a function of geography, history, cultural, and linguistic affinities. Obstacles to student exchange and possible solutions are considered in relation to: economic difficulties, legal and administrative obstacles, and cultural and linguistic obstacles. The arrangements in the various countries that affect teacher exchange, including measures for replacement and arrangements for salary and pensions, are addressed. Cooperative research programs among universities are considred in relation to agreements at the governmental level or university level and facilities made jointly available. A questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED214410

INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION IN THE EUROPE REGION

HE 014 646

unesco

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEPES
UNESCO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

STUDY EDITED BY THE EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

1981
BUCHAREST

ISBN 92-3-101941-4

PREFACE

The Constitution of Unesco adopted on the creation of the Organization stipulated the objective of "advancing through the educational, scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of common welfare of mankind", and assigned the task of promoting international co-operation in the domains within the Organization's purview.

Ever since the preparation of the First Conference of Ministers of Education of European Member States of Unesco, organized in Vienna, 1967, it has become apparent that in this Region higher education occupies a privileged position with respect to co-operation. The Conference insisted on the notion of problems common to all Member States, a notion which was emphasized at the symposium of specialists in charge of studying the modalities of establishing the European Centre for Higher Education. The Second Conference of Ministers of Education of European Member States held in Bucharest, 1973, included on its agenda the discussion of the principles and modalities of European co-operation in this field. Therefore it was only natural that CEPES should undertake the present study which is furthermore in accordance with the spirit of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (1975). The importance of this issue was emphasized by the Advisory Committee of the CEPES at its sessions in December 1976, November 1977 and October 1978, and this project was included in the approved Programme and Budget for 1979—1980.

The promotion of interuniversity co-operation has acquired several dimensions deriving from the exchange of persons, of information, ideas, results yielded by various experiences, as well as from the conjunction of activities and programmes. It can be regarded from several points of view : e.g. the improvement of the efficiency of institutions in a given country consequent to a process of mutual insemination which is conductive to a growth of the above exchanges. Interuniversity co-operation further makes possible a better utilization of the university potential

in the Member States of the Region. Last but not least, it contributes to the improvement of international understanding within the Region.

The Third Conference of Ministers of Education of the Member States of the Europe Region, organized in Sofia, 1980, fully confirmed the determination of the governments in the Region to embark on this threefold course.

Consequently, this study attempts not so much to establish an inventory of the various measures or instruments adopted to promote interuniversity co-operation in Europe, as to undertake a selective and necessarily incomplete analysis of certain aspects and forms of co-operation, of the problems and shortcomings encountered both with regard to the modalities employed and with respect to the density and intensity of the existing relations, as well as an analysis of the most promising experiences. This study, at least this is the goal it pursues, is designed to have an essentially practical character. In the context of growing expenses incurred by higher education further to its recent expansion and to its new task and of the financial constraints affecting the economic situation in numerous countries, the optimal utilization of available resources becomes a vital necessity. Therefore, it seems that the present study could not be better timed.

Mention should also be made of the fact that an increased interuniversity co-operation may enable universities to undertake new tasks in better conditions. Moreover it will encourage joint consideration of problems likely to emerge in the future decades, and whose importance for all the Member States taken as a whole is not in the least negligible.

The study is conceived to serve primarily government and university decision makers on matters of co-operation, as well as academics, researchers and students.

The CEPES would like to express its most sincere thanks to the decision makers and members of higher education institutions in the Region, who have sent through the National Commissions their replies to the questionnaire drawn up by the Centre for the collection of the necessary data and who have also furnished CEPES with documentation, often quite ample, on the subject in question. The Centre is also grateful to the members of the Advisory Committee and to the liaison officers of the Centre for their assistance in accomplishing this project. Finally, it would like to thank the International Association of Universities and in particular its Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Georges Daillant, for his valuable contribution to the elaboration of this study.

Audun Øfjord

Director CEPES

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	7
I. CONSIDERATIONS ON THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE	7
II. ORIGIN, NATURE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	11
III. ADOPTED METHODOLOGY AND ITS LIMITATIONS	12
CHAPTER I : EXISTING MODALITIES AND FORMS OF CO-OPERATION	13
I. INFORMAL CO-OPERATION	13
II. FORMAL CO-OPERATION : ITS LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY RESOURCES	15
III. AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION	16
IV. TYPES OF AGREEMENTS CONCERNING INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION : SUMMARY	20
V. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE DIFFERENT MODALITIES OF INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION — GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE	21
CHAPTER II : CO-OPERATION IN THE AREA OF STUDENT EXCHANGES	27
I. A FEW DATA ON EXCHANGE TRENDS	27
II. MODALITIES OF STUDENT EXCHANGES	30
III. OBSTACLES AND HINDRANCES TO STUDENT EXCHANGES : A FEW SUGGESTIONS TO SURMOUNT THEM	32
IV. A FEW CONCLUSIONS	41
CHAPTER III : CO-OPERATION REGARDING TEACHERS	43
I. SOME TYPES OF TEACHER MOBILITY	45
II. OBSTACLES AND INCENTIVES	46
III. A FEW CONCLUSIONS	50

Page

CHAPTER IV : CO-OPERATION IN RESEARCH 53

I. GENERAL DATA OF THE PROBLEM 53
II. EXCHANGE OF RESEARCHERS 55
III. JOINT RESEARCH PROGRAMMES 57

CHAPTER V : CO-OPERATION IN THE AREA OF DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION 59

I. EXCHANGES BETWEEN LIBRARIES AND LIBRARIANS 60
II. INFORMATION NETWORKS AND DATA BANKS 61
III. DOCUMENTATION CENTRES ON HIGHER EDUCATION 62

CHAPTER VI : CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF UNIVERSITY POLICY AND MANAGEMENT 65

I. POLICY AND DIRECTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION 65
II. MANAGEMENT 67

CONCLUDING REMARKS 69

ANNEX : QUESTIONNAIRE ON INTER-UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE 71

INTRODUCTION

I. CONSIDERATIONS ON THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND THE IMPORTANCE OF INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

Co-operation is an integral part of the very definition of the university since the university has as its principal function to institute, organize, and support a systematic collaboration among the men who elaborate, transmit, and seek knowledge. With respect to their internal organization of the structures of co-operation, universities also branch out into the world of knowledge since they must synthesize knowledge and doctrines from every point in time and from all places or to place them in confrontation one with the other. Universities live on borrowings, and the thought that they elaborate becomes little by little the common property of all. Together, they make an undivided domain. One only needs to look at their libraries : authors from every epoch and from every country are found side by side.

For a long time, the disposition of this sort of spontaneous co-operation hardly posed any problems : it seemed to work by itself. In medieval Europe, the tradition of university co-operation was, in fact, born at the same time as the university tradition itself, of which it is a consubstantial element.

It is true that in the beginning this co-operation was not very organized. Sometimes, following internal quarrels, one university emigrated in its own country or in another (Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, for example). Teachers moved around according to the graces of material or intellectual conditions which may have been offered to them, of their own affinity to certain thought, and sometimes because of persecution which they were subjected to. Students followed or left for another place in search of new teachings, and their condition was often very nomadic. Ideas and works circulated with the teachers and students. Thus was constituted a world of knowledge which at the same time was both mobile and homogeneous and in which controversy was not unknown, but which crossed political

borders and spread from one end of Europe to the other. Latin provided a common language.

Some people see in the first centuries of the university a sort of paradise lost of free co-operation, forgetting perhaps that among the reasons for the migrations at that time there was sometimes intolerance and sometimes merely material poverty. We can, of course, try to return to free circulation without necessarily returning to intolerance and poverty. However, we must point out that, historically, the unified field of university life became split little by little and powerful factors prevent it, even today, from becoming fully reconstituted. The Reformation perhaps signaled this evolution, not only because it questioned the institutional and doctrinal bases related to Catholicism, but also because it made of the universities an instrument and an origin of battles and political rivalries of which it was the cause or the pretext. And also, it must be added that the Reformation introduced the principles of free examination and challenge of arguments of authority, which constitute today an important condition for co-operation between universities. It must be further added that the German speaking countries, where the Lutheran movement begun, are the ones in which the university *Freizügigkeit* was maintained for the longest time. We must finally note, to skip over more than two centuries of relative stagnation in the university, that the spirit of the Reformation, as transformed as it may have been, was not foreign to the concepts of Humboldt and of other founders of the University of Berlin in the first years of the 19th century. However, the creation of the University of Berlin puts us face to face with another paradox. It has been said that the politicization of the university, or rather, its more marked inclusion in battles for power, its monopolization by the Princes, had contributed to the splitting of the unity of academic Europe. Now, the University of Berlin was clearly and explicitly created for political ends : the goal was to consolidate the intellectual and spiritual bases of the Prussian state which was then seriously threatened by Napoleonic invasions. However, the concepts which presided over this creation, thanks to a few clear-sighted men who were particularly sensitive to the needs of a whole era, were so broad, so ambitious, and so much marked by universality that they influenced almost all of Europe and then the United States, in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Not without undergoing important modifications (which undoubtedly would have disconcerted the authors), they were at the origin of the research university from which a certain unity of the scientific world was able to be structured. Politics is not always a cursed thing, which is after all an encouragement for those who see in European university co-operation an objective which itself is also of a political nature.

Nonetheless, while the Europe of the Enlightment was created outside of the university, in the salons, the literary cafes, the academies, and very widely through letters, from the 19th century on the scientific community based itself more and more on the universities which were oriented toward research and provided with the necessary equipment which was more and more expensive. We will not dwell here on the existence and the reality of this international and singularly European

community, in the sense of Unesco, to which the universities have furnished the intellectual, material, and logistic means in order for it to become, precisely, a community.

What must be done, however, is to show its limits. It is in fact, a community, but it is only scientific. It is completely oriented towards the advancement of the sciences, in particular the pure and natural sciences ; but for a long time it has concerned itself little with the goal of knowledge and with the use which came of it. At the moment when it put itself in place systematically, that is in the 19th century, the scientific community did nothing to prevent the worsening of national antagonisms; it worsened the power of devastation through arms and did little to prevent wars. Neither itself nor the universities which sustain its life played the peace making role which could have been expected of them.

We can, therefore, think that something new should be done, or at least attempted, in this Europe where so much power of the world is found, in order to pass from the simple community of experts to a community which is more universal, that is, embracing all dimensions of man. That means to assign to co-operation ends which surpass its simple scientific and academic goals (without diminishing its importance).

However, the search for a more intense or more profound university co-operation can appear to be countered by a certain number of recent developments. For a long time already higher education has been a part of the economic — and hence political — potential of nations and, as it represents in addition a very expensive investment, the temptation can be great for each one of them to orient it, with priority, if not exclusively, toward the satisfaction of its own needs. In a period of prosperity and expansion, such a tendency can only be latent. On the other hand, in a period of shortage, of recession, or of crisis such as what many countries have experienced for several years, international university co-operation risks to be presented as a luxury which can be more or less done without. As for the students themselves, the concern of making their studies profitable as quickly as possible can lead them to renounce studies abroad, which often cause a delay in their graduation if they are not part of a specific co-operation programme which takes such matters into account.

It is not perhaps in such a contingency that we can hope for a return to free circulation of students or to spontaneous and unorganized co-operation. Nor must we expect verbal declarations on the benefits of international co-operation to have much effect. Instead, it is a matter of "prouver le mouvement en marchant" and of establishing the usefulness of university co-operation by means of clearly defined and structured programmes, the cost of which can be known to a certain extent and the results of which can be measured in terms of enrichment of the knowledge and teaching, stimulation of research, savings in terms of resources through the joint use of certain personnel and equipment, and for students, the valorization of their training, including its worth on the labour market, due to their experience abroad. Far from appearing to be a costly luxury, co-operation can then be considered as a more productive and eventually, more economical utilization of available

resources. The recent multiplication of specific interuniversity agreements is undoubtedly headed in this direction. The non-strictly academic benefits of co-operation must then come about in addition, more understanding resulting from concrete co-operation between the men and women involved in the programmes.

However, there is more. In many countries, higher education tends not only to become nationalized, but to become regionalized. We know that in Norway or in Finland, for example, systematic efforts have been made to implant tertiary education in regions which until now have been deprived. Even where regional disparity was less pronounced, the often considerable multiplication of the number of establishments tends to anchor higher education more deeply in the local reality, all the more so since it intervened at a moment when a renewal of interest and attachment to the region was witnessed in the public. "To work in the country" is a henceforth current claim in France. More and more often, one can also "study in the country" there. The university image has thus become profoundly modified : one no longer deals with a few centers turned especially toward the nation or the international scientific community, where local and regional concerns were only marginal ; we are in the presence of a dense network of institutions more and more sensitive to their immediate environment, to its particularities, and to its needs.

This new university geography opens perhaps a new perspective to international co-operation. One can especially think that the more marked local colour of higher education should not be translated by an obliteration of its international dimension, but it instead calls for its corollary reinforcement so that "regionalization" does not become synonymous to "provincialization".

On the other hand, we must obviously avoid interuniversity co-operation itself from becoming "regionalized" to too great an extent and from limiting itself to countries showing common characteristics, and notably, neighbouring socio-economic regimes. Of course, the majority of the universities of the countries of the Europe Region of Unesco collaborate with the universities of developing countries and receive, sometimes in large number, students from them. Inside this Region, nonetheless, it is important to maintain the ties which have become established and which develop between the universities of the Western countries and those of the socialist countries. For obvious reasons, these ties are more sensitive than others to the risks of the world politics. More than the others, they must also be based on structured agreements. At least, they escape certain of the often rather inextricable difficulties which burden forms of co-operation related to aid. The Europe Region of Unesco presents the particularity of encompassing the majority of the industrialized countries and, perhaps with the exception of one or two, of not including developing countries. Interuniversity co-operation can thus be established on the basis of this reciprocity which is generally agreed upon to be considered as desirable for the balance and the health of interuniversity exchanges. Furthermore, the Europe of Unesco is par excellence the region of the world where very serious choices upon which the future of industrialized societies depends and, indirectly, that of other

societies, are operating. It is important from the evidence that universities, with their intellectual potential, participate in the debates which will prepare these choices.

II. ORIGIN, NATURE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

It can be said that the Unesco study comes at an appropriate time. Very important as far as its stake is concerned, interuniversity co-operation is at the same time poorly perceptible as for its real extent, its intensity, and its efficacity. Before suggesting directions for its development, it was necessary to try to define the situation and to chart the present tendencies. The Second Conference of Ministers of Education of European Member States held in Bucharest in 1973, felt the need for this and made it the object of one of its recommendations, which was the point of departure for the present study. The European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES), in Bucharest, which is an integral part of the Unesco Secretariat, took up the question, and its Advisory Committee, on the occasion of its fourth and fifth sessions (December, 1976 and November, 1977), expressed its wish that a study be undertaken. The Third Conference of Ministers of Education (Sofia, June, 1980) and the 21st session of the General Conference (Belgrade, September-October, 1980) confirmed the interest of the Member States of the Europe Region for such a project.

In order to facilitate the beginning and to specify the underlying concept, CEPES organized a consultation which was held in Paris at the Headquarters of Unesco on September 13-14, 1978. The participants, high officials and distinguished academics, were invited by the Director General to lend their experience in the area of interuniversity co-operation to the Secretariat. A preliminary document had been prepared by Mr. Georges Daillant, Assistant Secretary General of the International Association of Universities, who served as consultant.

We will take the paragraph concerning the goals and the nature of the study from the "Summary of Discussions" (ED-78/CS. 39/3) :

"The participants agreed with the Secretariat that the study cannot and should not aim at compiling an exhaustive inventory of the various agreements or regulations presently governing European bilateral and multilateral co-operation. It would be difficult to draw up such a document, which would have limited interest. On the contrary, what is needed is the analysis of information collected in order to draw up a synthesis document, starting from an inventory of positive experiences and those that could be transposed, such as gaps, obstacles, and failures noted in interuniversity co-operation. Such a study should therefore be selective, critical and interpretative, and, as far as possible, should give an assessment. It should aim at helping those responsible for higher education to recognize the necessity and the conditions for strengthening university co-operation ; numerous difficulties are encountered in such reinforcement, which seems essential both from the point of view of promoting international understanding and of improving the quality of higher education at national level."

III. ADOPTED METHODOLOGY AND ITS LIMITATIONS

Following this Consultation, a questionnaire was elaborated by CEPES, the text of which is found in the annex of this study. This questionnaire was sent by the Centre to competent national authorities, which sometimes sent it on to different academic or scientific sectors and, in the case of Norway, for example, to universities which answered individually. Answers were received from twenty-seven countries, some in great detail, others more succinct. These differences can be explained in part by the fact that the ministeries or other central bodies have greatly varying means and degrees of intervention into the life of higher education and are thus informed to different degrees. Moreover, inter-university co-operation is itself diversely formalized from country to country such that it is very risky to claim to measure its intensity by the number of formal agreements which can be traced. That is one of the major difficulties that this study encounters, a study which was intended at the beginning to explore the entire field of interuniversity co-operation in the broadest sense, including what is not organized by specific texts (and including, as far as possible, what takes place between establishments of higher education which are not universities).

Finally, it must be pointed out that, with the exception of a small number of cases, the answers contain few statistical data. We will take up this question of lack of information in greater detail in the appropriate chapters of the study. The Secretariat of the International Association of Universities, to which the editing was charged after CEPES made a preliminary analysis of the answers, tried to complete the information by using its own documentation ; but uncertainties exist on numerous points. Great care is thus needed in the interpretation and evaluation of a very complex and incompletely informed situation. The recommendations which can be made here will have to be considered, in the majority of cases, more as suggestions and themes to be thought about rather than as sure conclusions.

With these reservations, this study will examine the following points which concern, on the one hand, the ways and means by which co-operation is realized and, on the other hand, the principal areas to which it relates and which are, in the end, coextensive with the main areas of university activity itself :

1) Existing modalities and forms of co-operation
2) Co-operation in the area of student exchanges
3) Co-operation in the area of exchanges of teachers
4) Co-operation in the area of research
5) Co-operation in the area of documentation and information
6) Co-operation in the area of policy and administration.

1

EXISTING MODALITIES AND FORMS OF CO-OPERATION

It could have been possible to proceed in a way which is the opposite to the plan proposed here and to examine first of all the areas of co-operation, and only then, the legal forms and means through which it is realized. If we preferred to start by the latter, it was because they provide a point of departure and a framework for co-operation, define its possibilities, and sometimes explain its limits in certain areas. However, it should be emphasized that it is not always possible to establish a clear distinction between the instruments of co-operation and its contents and that we will, therefore, be led to take up again certain questions concerning modalities and forms when speaking of the areas. It is only through their concrete effectiveness in such and such a field of action that we can test the validity of the available instruments. This chapter, necessarily dry, will thus present only a sort of rather complex sketch since the legislative and regulatory apparatus governing co-operation differs considerably from country to country. It is only subsequently that the manner in which this mechanism functions can be judged.

I. INFORMAL CO-OPERATION

It may seem paradoxical to speak of "informal" co-operation in a chapter dealing with "forms" of co-operation. Nonetheless, the informality, if it does not properly speaking constitute a form, constitutes at least a modality of co-operation and perhaps a very important modality. Three variants will be differentiated :

a) First of all, the term informal co-operation can apply to everything that is also called free circulation of people. It concerns students who choose to enroll in a foreign university or teachers who, outside of any specific agreement, teach abroad. This term is mentioned here only as a reminder since reference will be made to it when student and

teacher exchanges are discussed. The importance that it has had historically in the constitution of an international university community and the place that it continues to occupy in certain countries of Western Europe and North America require it to be mentioned in this brief inventory of modalities of co-operation.

b) Informal co-operation is also the one that two or more establishments or departments, laboratories, etc., or even individual teachers-researchers can take part in without its being either sanctionned or precisely defined by a specific agreement. This is, furthermore, one of the oldest types of co-operation and it retains a considerable range. Founded on the basis of personal contact between colleagues whom certain scientific affinities and sometimes friendship bring together, by definition not very encumbered by bureaucracy, it is conceived to be particularly fruitful. Almost every country acknowledges its existence even if it seems to be less developed in the socialist countries where the planning of activities is the rule. Nonetheless, Hungary, for example, underscores its importance and, with more or less insistence, so do all of the so-called "Western" countries of the Region (to the extent that they answered the questionnaire). Of course, no one can quantify the importance, even on the scale of expanse since it is the property of this type of co-operation to defy measurement and analysis, except for those who are directly involved with it. Even its limitations defy analysis : as soon as two colleagues from different countries meet in any place and exchange information and ideas on their common discipline or on their respective disciplines, there is international disciplinary or interdisciplinary co-operation.

It thus appears impossible to devote long descriptions to this kind of co-operation. In any case, it escapes in large part the policies of governments and universities such that the recommendations that might be formulated for it may run the risk of being in vain. At most, it can be pointed out that, under present circumstances, this type is perhaps more vulnerable than the others :

— vulnerable to the restrictions which can be put on the free circulation of people and which are more easily lifted when they are part of a specific agreement ;

— vulnerable also to budgetary restriction since it is more difficult to appropriate precise and regular credits to informal co-operation, and since universities, like governments, may prefer to finance programmes corresponding to a policy decided upon by them and assured of continuation ;

— vulnerable finally to the change of the careers and of the destinies of individuals since this type of co-operation rests in large part on the personal relations of the participants.

Finally, it must be observed that the relative place occupied by informal co-operation in such and such a system is not fortuitous : it depends on more or less decentralized structures of the system, on its traditions and mentalities which it fashions and which fashion it. The more the autonomy of institutions and the independence of teachers is marked, the more chances there are to see informal co-operation corres-

ponding to a dominant climate of opinion develop. Its degree of compatibility with the whole system seems in any case to vary considerably from country to country, and we cannot hope to graft it with equal success on every system. What we can hope for is that where it is developed and active, the present difficulties and the tendency to the reinforcement of controls that they give rise to will not lead to its progressive decline.

II. FORMAL CO-OPERATION : ITS LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY RESOURCES

Interuniversity co-operation, even formal, has very diverse legal bases depending on the country. Even there, historical traditions and institutional customs play a large role. There are countries which feel the need to proclaim or to solemnly fix the principles which regulate public life with constitutional or legislative texts. There are others which tend to content themselves with unwritten rules or to dispense with rules whenever they feel that it is possible. The old distinction between countries with written laws and countries with unwritten customary laws could be found, although blurred by numerous recent developments even in the area of interuniversity co-operation.

France, for example, which the French Revolution and the Napoleonic regime have made a country with written laws par excellence, has defined the main lines of the organization and functioning of the universities by a law "the frame law" of higher education of 1968, and this law, in Article 2, explicitly evokes international co-operation among the missions of higher education. A decree of application dated February 28, 1972, defines in greater detail the conditions according to which this mission can be assured. The same holds for the Federal Republic of Germany where the federal "frame law" of higher education in the different *Länder* cites international co-operation among the number of missions of higher education. As for the German Democratic Republic, the principles which activate scientific development and international co-operation stem from its Constitution. The law on the system of unified socialist education of February, 1965, and regulatory texts determine, moreover, the conditions and the institutional mechanisms by which interuniversity co-operation is effected. In Turkey, to take another example, each action of university co-operation is governed by an article of the law and must be conducted in the framework of a governmental agreement (cultural or technical agreement signed between Turkey and another government).

At the other extreme, we find countries whose tradition has emphasized unwritten customary law for a long time, and where university autonomy is still very marked : the United Kingdom, for example, where no law regulates in a uniform manner the structure and the functioning of the universities which take their legal existence from royal charters which were granted to them individually. In this case, certain legislative arrangements can indeed affect interuniversity co-operation, but none govern them globally. Ireland, the United States, Canada (with the exception of Quebec province) present, *mutatis mutandis*, analogous situations.

It must still be observed that certain international bilateral or unilateral agreements, when they have been submitted for ratification, become national law and can thereby govern co-operation which may be in their domain of application. This is what the Italian answer in particular recalls.

It is obviously not possible to draw very precise conclusions from this brief overview. The presence or absence of laws concerning specifically higher education depends on the system which is itself deeply rooted in a national context which surpasses it. It would be both in vain and presumptuous to advocate either the promulgation or the abrogation of laws in this area. What can be perhaps advanced is that, in the case where the law defines the tasks and the organization of higher education, it is desirable that this law mention that international co-operation is part of the constituent missions of the university.

In general, it is also desirable that the law give establishments of higher education the legal capacity to conclude agreements with other establishments. One country at least, Austria, has observed that this is not the case there.

III. AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION

What will be mainly examined here is the respective roles of governments (or states) and universities (or other institutions) in the conception, the orientation, and the implementation of international university co-operation ; but we shall also see that other national or international bodies can intervene at one stage or another.

a) *The respective roles of states and universities in the founding and implementation of co-operation programmes*

There is a series of countries where formal interuniversity co-operation is possible only in the framework and application of intergovernmental agreements, either submitted or not for the ratification of Parliament. In these cases, the states are thus the initiators of the co-operation and they determine its broad orientation.

In the German Democratic Republic, for example, the Council of Ministers, acting by delegation of the People's Chamber (Volkskammer), makes fundamental decisions and enacts basic regulations concerning the organization of international relations, even in the area of higher education. In this framework, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on the one hand, and the Ministry of Higher Education and Specialized Secondary Education, on the other hand, are empowered to conclude agreements concerning co-operation. It is, thus, only at the stage of implementation and execution (and eventually preliminary consultation) that the universities take part. Of course, they must agree with their partners on the exact forms of their co-operation.

A similar pattern is found in Czechoslovakia. In the framework of the governmental policy, it is the Governmental Committee for cultural, educational, scientific, and medical relations with other countries which concludes the co-operation agreements. Universities are then chosen with the application of the agreements in mind. At this stage, they meet

directly with their foreign partners to fix the forms and modalities of their co-operation. These understandings between universities can be evaluated and revised periodically.

With slight changes and variants, this is the system practiced in general by the socialist countries, especially in their relations with non-socialist countries. Inside the socialist community itself, there exist, moreover, various planning and co-ordination bodies which influence national policy in this area.

It is to be noted that this system is in the logic of the planning of the different branches of activity at the state level. It is on this level that it is necessary to define the needs, to fix the priorities, to evaluate the available means, and to distribute the tasks. But, nonetheless, the framework being designed in this manner, a considerable role still falls to the universities or to other implementation bodies which are charged with giving them a concrete and effective content.

It is not only in the socialist countries, however, that the overall framework of interuniversity co-operation is fixed by intergovernmental agreements. It is also the case in Italy, for example, in Portugal, in Turkey, as we have seen, and at the other end of the continent, in Norway and Finland. In the latter country, however, the faculties and the departments, as opposed to the universities, strictly speaking, have ample latitude in co-operation with their foreign counterparts outside the arrangements of the intergovernmental agreements. In Spain, also, it is the Ministry of Universities and Research, through the intermediary of its department of international co-operation which concludes agreements ; but the rectors of the universities, if they have the necessary funds, can equally do it with the authorization of the Ministry.

In other countries, on the contrary, the universities themselves determine their own policy of co-operation and conclude agreements with their foreign partners. As is mentioned in the Canadian answer, however, that does not mean that intergovernmental cultural agreements play no role at all. They can, on the contrary, provide incitement, facilities for negociations, and appreciable financial credit. The same applies to international programmes launched by official bodies of certain countries and in which universities may take part. In the United States, for example, a highly decentralized country displaying a wide range of institutions and various agencies, international action is distributed among a large number of them : the State Department, International Communication Agency, Agency for International Development, the National Academy of Sciences, and many other bodies.

With these reservations, a complete or broad initiative in co-operation agreements is left to the universities of countries such as the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Canada, the United States of America, France, Ireland, Israel, the United Kingdom, and Switzerland. In France, where interuniversity agreements have scored a remarkable increase during the last few years, they must be submitted to the Ministry of Universities and to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or to the Ministry of Co-operation (for francophone Africa in the south of the Sahara) the role of which, purely formal, consists especially of verifying their conformity to existing regulations on international co-operation. Unless there

is opposition from these ministries, the agreements can be concluded. Input from these ministries does not necessarily stop there ; it can also be financial. When universities do not have the means to finance an agreement from their regular budget, they have the possibility of asking the Ministry of Universities, and sometimes the Ministry of Co-operation, for credits specially designated to the institution of the agreement. In the Federal Republic of Germany, the interuniversity agreements are normally concluded in consultation with the governments of the *Länder* in question, which assure to a great extent the financing. In 1974, for example, the total budget of the *Länder* for co-operation rose to more than 40 million DM.

We shall speak more about the question of financing co-operation in the course of this study, but it should be pointed out here that the governments assure, directly or indirectly, the bulk of the budget, even when it is the universities which negociate, conclude, and institute the agreements. Of course, in a few countries, like the United States, private foundations and other agencies can play an important role and certain "non-public" universities have private resources which they can utilize for co-operation. In the whole of Europe, nonetheless, it is the governments — central or provincial — which furnish the most of the necessary funds to higher education and therefore to international university co-operation. In certain cases, they assign specific credits ; in others, they leave the universities free to use a portion of the total funds which have been assigned to them. Whatever the advantages of the last system may be, we may wonder if this is one where governments are most likely to "forget" interuniversity co-operation and, in a period of crisis, not to keep its requirements enough in mind in the calculation of the funds which they allocate to their universities. This is, nonetheless, only a conjecture which the available data do not allow us to verify.

Finally, it must be pointed out that governments sometimes participate in the financing of interuniversity co-operation through *international organizations* which they belong to and contribute to. It is not the purpose here to describe in detail the pertinent activities of Unesco, of the Council of Europe, of the OECD, etc., but we shall cite as an example, the programme launched by the Commission of European Communities to encourage the implementation of joint programmes and diplomas between establishments of higher education of the countries of the Community. The initiative rests with the institutions which desire to co-operate, and it is up to them to establish the modalities of this co-operation ; but, however, upon request to the Institute of Education of the European Foundation of Culture, which is in charge of examining the dossiers, they can receive financial aid from the Commission to assure the starting of the programme.

b) *The co-ordination of the programmes and the co-operation agreements at the national level*

The question of the national co-ordination of co-operation programmes is in theory a little different from that of its establishment and of its operation. In practice, nonetheless, this difference is blurred when international university co-operation has governmental origin and thus is, in principle, translated into a concerted and coherent policy. In fact, nume-

18

rous countries indicate that the principal body of co-ordination is the Ministry of Education or of Higher Education, sometimes in conjunction with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (for example, in Italy or in the German Democratic Republic) or several other bodies (for example in Turkey). In Norway, a specialized service of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs assures the co-ordination.

Even in countries where co-operation depends largely on the initiative of the universities, but where ministeries intervene for one reason or another, the latter are generally seen to be involved with a certain co-ordination role. In France, for example, we find the triad : Ministry of Universities, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Co-operation.

Finally, in a certain number of countries where the autonomy of universities in the matter of international co-operation is particularly prominent, it is the Conference of Rectors or equivalent bodies consisting of the heads of the institutions which assure the co-ordination when necessary. The documentation assembled for this study does not allow for any conjecture on the extent of such co-ordination.

However, it should be noted that the National Conference of Rectors or Presidents, the Committees of Vice-Chancellors, etc. have not only a co-ordinating role in the national framework but also tend to become direct partners in international co-operation, mainly in the mutual recognition of studies and diplomas. For example, it is the West German and French Conferences of Rectors which to a large extent prepared and negociated the apparatus for mutual recognition which was established between the Federal Republic of Germany and France. Afterwards, they were not legally party to the respective agreements which, as a matter of fact, did not result in the signature of a document of international law, but were sanctioned by internal measures taken parallelly by the governments of the two countries according to their national law. The role of the Conferences was very important and can be described as a double co-ordination :

— co-ordination between the universities of the two countries concerning the mutual recognition of studies and diplomas ;

— internal co-ordination of the policy of universities in one country concerning the diplomas granted by universities in the other country.

Other similar examples could be given, especially in Western Europe. Although we may be leaving the strict area of the co-ordination of co-operation at the national level, it is perhaps not far from the topic to take into account the role of interuniversity organizations and, in particular as concerns Europe, of the Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universites (CRE), which we shall have the opportunity to speak about later. The latter does not directly have as its purpose to promote interuniversity co-operation in the different academic disciplines, but instead to favour the examination of broad questions of university policy, including international co-operation, as they are posed to its members. It thus creates an atmosphere favourable to the co-ordination, the planning, and to the adoption of common measures not only between colleagues of different countries but also, if such be the case, between colleagues of a same country who participate in its activities. The International Association of Universities

largely exceeds the European framework, but it provides contact and planning opportunities between all of the universities of Europe, including those which do not participate in the CRE. Among the other organizations which assure a co-operation between certain categories of universities of the Region, we can cite the Association of the Commonwealth Universities (ACU), the Association of Partially or Entirely French Speaking Universities (AUPELF), and the International Federation of Catholic Universities (IFCU). With respect to the socialist countries, co-operation between rectors or between individual institutions seems less structured, but that does not in any way mean that it is nonexistant : bilateral or multilateral meetings of rectors frequently take place.

It also goes without saying that the different intergovernmental organizations which work in the Region favour co-ordination, including possibly action at the national level ; international action, in fact, does not constitute, or should not constitute, a sector entirely distinct and cut off from national realities : it is designed to reflect the habits or the behaviour of each country and to impregnate the very fabric of national life.

Finally, although the responses to the questionnaire allow little room for it, we must also mention the action of bodies whose statutes and ties with the state can vary, but which play a role of intermediary in university co-operation and, of course, have their own policy : the British Council of the United Kingdom, for example, the DAAD [1] in the Federal Republic of Germany, the NUFFIC [2] in the Netherlands, etc. These organizations will be described in greater detail under the different areas of co-operation.

IV. TYPES OF AGREEMENTS CONCERNING INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION : SUMMARY

A certain typology of agreements concerning interuniversity co-operation emerges undoubtedly from the preceding description, but it is perhaps not useless to systematically summarize their main elements. We can propose the following classification already adopted by the questionnaire :

a) Participation in multilateral co-operation in the framework of international organizations.

b) Multilateral or bilateral agreements on government level.

c) Multilateral or bilateral conventions between universities or other institutions.

d) Sectoral conventions or understandings between faculties, departments, laboratories, research units, etc.

e) Informal arrangements.

The answers received on these points must be interpreted with care, for it is not sure that the questions were interpreted in the same way by all of those who responded. A majority of countries say that they

[1] „Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst" (German Office of University Exchanges).

[2] "Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Co-operation".

practice all of these forms of co-operation, but it is in the majority of cases difficult to determine the extent of each one in the global effort of co-operation — and perhaps it is impossible to evaluate it precisely, especially in regards with (e) and even (d). As for (c), the answers do not always permit us to establish univocally if it is a question of conventions concluded independently by the universities or arrangements made between them in the execution of agreements concluded previously by their respective governments. Finally, a certain number of countries do not mention (a), whereas it is known that they are members of Unesco, of the Council of Europe, of the OECD, of the EEC, etc., each of the organizations operating also in the area of university co-operation, and the first two, especially, having programmes on recognition of titles, studies, and diplomas (discussion of these programmes will be reserved for areas of co-operation). It seems, then, that certain respondants to the questionnaire first of all wanted to emphasize the most important type of co-operation in their country, which brings us to the following point, which is more conclusive than this simple catalogue of possible modalities of co-operation.

V. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE DIFFERENT MODALITIES OF INTERUNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION — GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE

Here again, we must be careful in the manipulation of the data furnished by the answers to the questionnaire, since it is not sure that all the respondants gave exactly the same meaning to the same terms. Upon reading these answers, two observations must be made, one rather negative, the other positive :

a) From a negative point of view, it is to be noted that rather few answers (Italy, the German Democratic Republic are exceptions) lay any special emphasis to the importance of the *multilateral co-operation which is found at the heart of international organizations.* This relative failure of recognition can appear deceiving, but it is perhaps explainable. First of all, with certain exceptions, the activities of international organizations do not aim directly at setting up interuniversity co-operation programmes in the strict sense of the term, which constitute the principal domain of the study. But above all, there is a whole aspect of their action which is neither measurable nor immediately perceptible, to the effect that it is often overlooked. We forget that beyond the very utility of each of their programmes or even of the ensemble of their programmes, the international bodies, by their very system of operation, whatever be their goal, contribute to the creation of a climate of co-operation which can favour the setting up of collaboration even outside of their confines. Through their intermediary, ministers of education, for example, officials, universities learn to know each other and become habituated to collaboration. The national agencies become more conscious of the international dimensions of their action, information pipelines are set up, and we see appearing something like an international arena of co-operation which, with more or less intensity, crosses all the countries. In short,

there is a whole aspect of the activity of international organizations, which defies not only precise analysis but also, very often, conscious perception.

b) From a positive point of view, it is striking to see that the great majority of countries agree to valorize most particularly direct co-operation from university to university (Romania, for example, insists on this point). Certain countries, of course, equally underline the importance of intergovernmental agreements as a point of departure and as logistic support for interuniversity co-operation properly speaking. Others, rather numerous, attach much value to sectoral collaboration between subdivisions of the university and to informal agreements. Ranging between these two extremes, nonetheless, almost all responses underline the decisive role of this central axis : the co-operation from university to university. Perhaps this provides some reason for relativizing a little the scope of the question of procedures, forms and modalities. Even where universities are not the signatories of the formal agreements on which their co-operation is founded (and there are a few countries where they do not have the legal capacity), they must assure concretely their application, and to do so it is necessary for universities to get along one way or another with each other, and it is also essential that they should find some people truly resolved to run the programmes and to assure their success — in other words, people who are inspired by the same type of motivation as those who are committed to informal co-operation.

However, one of the reasons why the agreements and understandings from university to university are seen to be relatively privileged is perhaps that they are more easily counted and analysed than sectoral agreements or, more particularly, than informal co-operation. The authors of this study have been acquainted with large universities which are anxious to keep an uncomplicated and efficient administration, and which strived to list all of the co-operation activities which take place within their walls : in every case, the investigation was long and complex, which leads us to believe that, at least in certain countries, collaboration organized at a level lower than that of central universities holds in fact a very important place. And it is possible that university administrations or others are biased in favour of actions that are closer within their grasp and obtainable at less cost.

With these reservations made, we can, nonetheless, estimate that interuniversity agreements, directly concluded or through the application of governmental cultural agreements, constitute a particularly important instrument for co-operation and that they are instead under progress and diversification. This is particularly felt in the case of France since the number of agreements went from 61 in 1975 to 220 in 1979.

The other answers to the questionnaire do not give such precise figures, but thanks to its own documentation and to the information which had been furnished for the preliminary phase of the study, the Secretariat of the IAU strived to establish statistics, even very rudimentary, but which at least give orders of magnitude. These figures are not entirely up to date, and they do not concern all of the countries covered by the survey. Moreover, certain include all of the institutions of higher education or their subdivisions, while others refer only to universities strictly speaking. They are not directly comparable and are given here

only as indications. To illustrate the statistical discrepancy which can arise according to the category of arrangements in question, it can be pointed out that the United Kingdom counted in 1974, 162 arrangements with France. Considering only interuniversity agreements *stricto sensu*, France only mentions 36 in 1976.

According to the data gathered in 1977 by the Conference of West German Rectors, the universities of the Federal Republic of Germany had at that date 257 agreements with universities in other countries of the Europe Region. According to the information gathered by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the universities of this country had, in 1976, 470 agreements with institutions of the countries in the Region, but this figure includes also agreements concluded with research centers, foundations, museums, etc.

As for the United Kingdom, according to a census taken by the British Council in 1974, we arrive at the impressing figure of 792 agreements or arrangements of every order passed either by polytechnics or by subdivisions of these institutions (which makes this figure uncomparable, as was said, with those furnished by other countries) as well as by universities. According to the Swiss Central University Office, the figure for Switzerland was 121 agreements in 1978, some of which were concluded by the Office itself, and not by a university. Finally, according to data furnished in 1976 by the Union of Yugoslav Universities, these universities were linked by 108 agreements with universities of the Europe Region.

If we now examine the *geographic distribution* of the agreements, several careful generalizations appear possible in spite of the partial and fragmentary character of the available information.

i) First of all, the socio-political regime has obvious repercussions on the frequency of agreements. Although we do not have precise figures at our disposal for the majority of cases, all of the socialist countries which answered the survey, for example, indicate a particularly intense co-operation with the other countries of the socialist community and especially with the USSR. Even in Yugoslavia, we could count in 1976, 17 agreements with the USSR and 14 with the German Democratic Republic, whereas with the Western country which headed of list, the Federal Republic of Germany, we could point out only 10 agreements. In 1974, the United Kingdom claimed 145 agreements or arrangements with the United States, 162 with France, 121 with the Federal Republic of Germany, 13 with Czechoslovakia, and 8 with the USSR.

It must be pointed out however that these figures are dated and that a certain number of answers point out a notable growth in recent years of co-operation between socialist and Western countries. A particularly eloquent example of this is given by France and Poland which, according to one figure furnished by the first country, concluded no fewer than 53 agreements during the recent years. Among the partners of France, Poland heads the list, at least by the number of understandings. The countries which follow are the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, with 36 and 35 agreements, respectively. Turkey, also indicates cultural and scientific exchange agreements signed yearly with most of the socialist countries, including Albania.

On the other hand, a reduced number of agreements does not signify absence of agreements. In reality, it seems that most of the countries of the Region are linked to most of the others, if only by 1, 2, 3, or 4 agreements. A network of links, more or less dense, more or less thin, exists which might be further developed.

ii) In the second place, the intensity of the co-operation appears also to be a function of geography, history, cultural, and linguistic affinities. It is particularly strong between countries which are at the same time neighbours by geography, close because of culture, and tied by a very old university tradition: France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom, for example. In the past, the German speaking universities constituted a kind of unique "university space", and traces of it still can be found. Likewise, it should not be surprising to find an active co-operation between Belgium and France, and between Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and, of course, the United States. From this point of view, the Franco-Polish collaboration, as remarkable as it may be, can be explained by the ties and the cultural sympathies which are tradition between the two countries.

Nothing is more normal than this co-operation between neighbouring countries favoured by a long past of relations and exchanges. We can wonder, nonetheless, if there is no room for a wider diversification and for the creation of new networks of relations. The co-operation between the Scandinavian countries and the countries of Latin Europe, for example, does not seem very healthy, and it would be interesting to intensify it.

iii) The answers to the questionnaire do not permit the identification of disciplines or areas of study in which co-operation is most active. France points out, however, that during the last few years, it has developed particularly in the scientific and medical areas. We know, moreover, that certain of the joint programmes supported by the EEC deal with various branches of technology or management. It seems, then, that co-operation tends to develop well beyond the traditional areas of foreign languages and literatures.

If we try to draw a few *conclusions* from the available information, we can perhaps advance the claim that a certain number of countries continue to see in informal co-operation the most fruitful type of co-operation, but that co-operation carried out in the framework of agreements from university to university (capped or not by governmental agreements) tends to develop. It has the advantage of permitting a clear definition of the objectives and the means of attaining them, hence of articulating a long term policy, of being guaranteed by a true institutional commitment, of being better able to be evaluated than more diffuse and elusive forms of co-operation, and finally of making lasting rapprochements between particular institutions. As has already been pointed out, the economic and financial crisis will lead perhaps to privileging this type of co-operation which has, in addition, the advantage, in certain cases, of facilitating the solution of the mutual recognition of diplomas or partial studies. It has also happened that agreements concluded on this subject between two universities serve as a basis for wider agreements, concluded at the national level. Even there, it is a question of saving —

under the circumstances of saving time devoted to studying for students interested in the agreements and who spend a part of their studies abroad. In times of poverty, it is necessary to obtain the maximum *tangible* results and in some way which are accountable with the means clearly marked for this end. Co-operation structured by agreements responds perhaps better to this requirement, an observation which is certainly not a plea in favour of the abandonment of informal co-operation where it is possible and flourishing.

Although most of the countries point out a certain development of interuniversity co-operation during recent years and that in certain cases — notably that of Spain and Portugal — this development has been very considerable, it seems that financial constraints have slowed the dynamic of this movement. As it is not probable that the financial constraints will disappear or even become reduced during the next few years, we could formulate a double wish :

— that governments and universities become more conscious of the necessity of international university co-operation and be ready to consent to greater credits for it ;

— that the means be found to make it more efficient and to make this efficiency more visible and more tangible for those who are charged with public funds.

On this last point, it must be stressed that if we have used here the number of agreements as an indicator of the intensity of inter-university co-operation, it is with the understanding that it is a very imperfect indicator. First, there are agreements which, once signed, remain more or less dormant. Then, a great number of agreements, even when applied, can betray an excessive scattering, a "sprinkling" of means, and a certain indecision in the choice of a policy. In that case, a tightening of relations and a concentration of the means on a smaller number of truly successful understandings is preferable.

2

CO-OPERATION IN THE AREA OF STUDENT EXCHANGES

It is essentially for students and thanks to students — if you will excuse the truism — that universities exist and that students come to them mainly for training, but secondarily also to train the teachers by constituting for them an audience before whom they can clarify or refine their ideas. In this last role, foreigners from different intellectual horizons and carriers of new or unexpected questions can be particularly useful. They ensure an infusion of fresh blood and, in the final analysis, a richness for the universities which accept them. But if the conditions are favourable and if this reception is well organized, they can derive for themselves an irreplaceable enrichment from this experience. They are most often at the age when their sensibility and their thought are the most receptive, and when the experience of alterity has the most chance of being lived in an open and positive manner. Of course, we must not imagine that segregation and hostilities between national groups are absent in the university milieu nor that living together on the same campus necessarily gives birth to concord and harmony. But, nonetheless, the university is more than any other institution oriented toward understanding. And in a world, as overlapping as ours is, where the data of so many problems as well as the impact of their solutions are international, it is obviously hoped that a large proportion of future generations have an international or multinational experience and training. From all points of view — that of the universities, that of the individuals, and that of future societies — we can thus believe that student exchanges must constitute a very important part of co-operation ; the majority of countries indicate that they in fact represent one of the essential elements.

I. A FEW DATA ON EXCHANGE TRENDS

The answers to the questionnaire contain relatively few statistical data on student exchange trends inside the Europe Region. We have, therefore, tried to complete them with calculations made from the *Unesco*

Statistical Yearbook 1978/1979, the figures of which are for most of 1976.

It should be pointed out that in the Europe Region, the foreign students are of very diverse origins. A certain number of countries receive especially students from developing countries. It is the case of France which, for its part, gives precise figures up to the academic year 1977/1978. That year, the foreign students from all countries represented 12.68% of the total number of students, and European students 2.4%. In the United Kingdom and in Spain, about 20% of the foreign students came from the Europe Region in 1976. For other countries, the percentage was still lower : about 14% for the United States, 12% for Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, 7% for Romania and Greece. In the United States, a country for which we have recent statistics at our disposal, the students from the Europe Region in 1978/79 numbered 36,810 (of which 1,170 from Eastern Europe) out of a total of 263,900 foreign students, or about 14%.

In the United States, the majority of the European students come from Canada, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, France, and the Netherlands. In France, the majority come from North America (the United States and Canada: 4,500), Greece, the Federal Republic of Germany, Spain, the United Kingdom, Italy, Portugal, and Poland. In the United Kingdom, they are especially from the United States, Greece, Canada, and the Federal Republic of Germany.

For other European countries, on the contrary, the movements of students within the Europe Region are much more important. For Canada (where 1/6 of the foreign students come from the United States) [1], Belgium, Poland, and Ireland, for example, the students from the Europe Region constituted nearly half of the total of students in 1976. In the Federal Republic of Germany they reached nearly 45% and came especially from Greece, the United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and the Scandinavian countries.

Still other countries received many more students from the Europe Region than from developing countries. In Finland, Sweden, and in Denmark, between 70 and 80% of the foreign students are European. In Switzerland, where about 20% of the students are foreign, which constitutes undoubtedly a noteworthy record, the number of students coming from European countries passed 70% of the total (mainly from the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Czechoslovakia, and the United States of America).

In Austria and in Italy also, they reached 73%. In the first mentioned country, the majority come from the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, and Greece. In the latter country, most of them were Greek (16,593, which constitutes more than half of the total number of foreign students in Italy).

These figures show that it is necessary to understand the word "exchange" in a broad sense since, even inside Europe, the movements of students are sometimes one way movements — or almost. It is the case with the Greek students in Italy which we have just seen (only 16

[1] For the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom, and Canada, the data are from 1978—1979.

Italian students in Greece at the same time) or even with the French students in the United Kingdom which, in 1978, numbered 184 against more then 2,000 British in France.

On the other hand, if we compare the figures between France and the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, we see that there is truly "exchange". In Belgium, the quota of grant holders received equals that of the number of Belgians receiving a grant from the countries of the community. The Scandinavian countries seem to have a rather balanced number of exchanges among themselves. The USSR exchanges students with the other socialist countries for summer courses (more than 11,000 Soviets studied in other countries of Eastern Europe, and an equal number of students from the countries of Eastern Europe were registered in the USSR). As we have already pointed out, certain socialist countries have rather sustained exchanges not only with the countries of the East (the majority of the exchanges) but also with Western countries. It is the case of Poland and the German Democratic Republic which receive numerous foreign students, 33% of whom are Europeans. Czechoslovakia — which also has 33% European foreign students — receives a significant number of students from the Federal Republic of Germany and from Greece. Romania has increased the number of its foreign students considerably in these last few years (they went from 3,000 to 16,000), but a great majority of them come from developing countries. These figures give a few indications on the relative intensity of the exchanges between the different countries of the Region. Nevertheless, in the opinion of many, the level of inter-European student mobility is rather low. According to the data gathered by the EEC, for example, the students coming from Member States other than theirs represented only 0.5% of the total number of students of the Community [1]. Applying to a group of countries where exchanges are so dense and whose economies are so overlapping, such a figure does not seem very high. In many cases, student mobility even tends to diminish : according to the figures of Unesco, the percentage of students from the Federal Republic of Germany who studied abroad (all countries included) seems to have fallen from 3.1% in 1961 to 1.2% in 1975 [2]. This reduction seemed sufficiently alarming so that the Bundestag took up the matter and held talks about it which resounded in the public opinion. (Today the percentage has risen again to 5.5%). We must thus ask ourselves what are the reasons for this tendency toward immobility among European students and shall come back to this under obstacles to exchanges. But beforehand, we shall examine briefly the means of the exchanges, and we shall try to see what types of mobility are the most affected by the trend that we have observed.

---

[1] Cf. Alan Smith : *From "Europhoria" to Pragmatism : towards a new start for higher education co-operation in Europe ?* In : *European Journal of Education* No. 1, 1980, p. 83.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 80.

II. MODALITIES OF STUDENT EXCHANGES

The developments which have been devoted to the forms and modalities of co-operation in general make a long account on this point unnecessary which constitutes only a particular, albeit very important, case of it.

A certain number of exchanges are effected through cultural, most often bilateral agreements : it is in particular the case between socialist countries, for which it is the most general procedure. Still others are done through interinstitutional agreements and we have seen that France, for example, through the intermediary of the Ministry of Universities and its General Delegation for International University Relations (DRUI) has particularly encouraged, these last years, this type of co-operation which certain socialist countries practice also, including co-operation with institutions of Western countries (notably Poland and the German Democratic Republic). We have also seen that, under the impulse of the EEC, these agreements could take the particularly advanced form of joint study and diploma programmes between institutions of two and often three countries. Some 120 programmes of this type have been started since the beginning of the project in 1976/1977 [1], of which nearly three quarters involved British institutions. The Federal Republic of Germany and France are, in equal proportion, the other most important partners of such arrangements (Italy, however, has been taking a more active part since a very recent date). Such arrangements, of course, surpass the simple exchange of students and tend to create true consortiums of institutions, as is the case in the United States. We bring this point up here since the students of the participating institutions can most often take a determined part of their studies in at least two of these institutions.

Another form of organized exchange is practiced especially by the universities in the United States and constitutes one of the most important and most original elements of their international co-operation. We are speaking of the *Junior Year Abroad* (a year of study in a foreign university institution) begun in the twenties on behalf of the students of several exclusive women's colleges. These students have thus inaugurated a model of co-operation which promised a good future and which has, since then, developed considerably and has become very flexible ; the stay of the students in the foreign university, where they take either regular courses or special courses for foreigners, can be of varying duration — one semester to two years — and of various levels, but they are fully recognized by the home university in the form of "credits". Should the occasion arise, this university sends its own teachers abroad with the students so as to assure supplementary or complementary training. During 1977—1978, 481 American colleges and universities counted 763 programmes of this type, of which 577 in collaboration with an institution of the Europe Region [2]. We can well see the amplitude of this kind of co-operation. Most of the programmes deal with the language and literature of the host country, but a broad range of other programmes is equally offered. Finally, student exchanges can take place in the framework of intersectorial agree-

[1] Cf. Alan Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

[2] Documentation provided by the "*International Institute of Education*". New York.

ments or informal arrangements. In the Western countries, nonetheless, the student mobility comes, in large measure, from the "free circulation" of people and results from individual choices, outside of any particular agreement. Austria, for example, receives a considerable number of foreign students, whereas its universities do not have the possibility of passing agreements. We shall not, however, necessarily speak of "unorganized" mobility, because these individual choices can be guided and, if the need arises, thanks to scholarship programmes, financially supported by organizations which play a very important intermediary role : the British Council in the United Kingdom, for example, the German Office of University Exchanges (DAAD) in the Federal Republic of Germany, the NUFFIC Foundation in the Netherlands, the International Institute of Education in the United States (a list which is not exhaustive). The Ministries of Education or of Foreign Affairs can also play an important role in this regard, as well as the diplomatic departments which, in the case of France for example, transmits "preregistration" dossiers in the cases where they are required.

According to numerous testimony, this form of mobility, resting mainly on the individual choice of students, tends to diminish, at least as concerns exchanges between European countries. In certain cases, it has been pointed out that certain scholarships offered for study abroad are not used. There can be exceptions to this relative decline, especially in the training for which access is limited by a *numerus clausus* in certain countries and not in others. It is possible also that third cycle or post-graduation programmes are relatively less affected by this phenomenon than pre-graduation programmes, although it is rather difficult to verify it according to the available documentation which does not permit a precise examination of student exchanges according to level of study. Certain countries (Finland, France, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States) show a certain preponderance of undergraduate programmes, while others (Ireland) seem to receive relatively more students in post-graduation studies. Belgium shows that its students go mainly abroad for 3rd cycle studies. Between the socialist countries, exchanges seem to be found at two levels. The USSR, however, which like Romania receives a large number of foreign students for courses of study leading to the first diploma, directs its main efforts to students from developing countries. A form of co-operation which seems broadly developed between the socialist countries deals with practical workshops for production or in laboratories, which are organized in the summer semester. Let us also point out, on this subject, that the universities of many countries of Europe organize special summer courses for foreigners. They can be very stimulating but are outside the general framework of regular courses and, to a certain extent, of the limits which the present study imposes. To have a more precise idea of the relative specific proportion of foreign students in the different cycles or levels of studies, it would be necessary to have data on the distribution of the national students in the advanced courses but the percentage of foreigners can be more or less higher than in the less advanced. Furthermore, there is reason to wonder if informal co-operation, which eludes statistics for the large part, is not relatively more developed on the level of advanced studies which interests smaller

circles, inside which personal relationships are easier and better sustained. It has been pointed out to us that a certain number of French graduates, for example, seek complementary training abroad without necessarily registering for an advanced degree in the receiving country. Thus, we shall be careful not to draw specific conclusions from these points.

What seems possible to affirm, on the other hand, is that there is a level where very few exchanges appear : it concerns the so called continuing education and recycling or improvement courses. The answers to the questionnaire, in any case, hardly dwell on this point. We know, however, that certain things are done. The USSR, to take an example, organizes improvement courses for foreign Russian language teachers (including Europeans). Among the students of certain developing countries who are preparing an Advanced Studies Diploma (DEA) or a "doctorat de troisième cycle" in France, a certain number of them have already occupied or occupy positions of responsibility in their countries. It is, however, difficult, with the sources at our disposal, to get an idea of the amplitude of the phenomenon and to know to what extent it applies to the nationals of the European countries. Still, that is not a question of courses which concern "recycling" in the strict sense.

Of course, what one can appropriately call continuing education courses are still undergoing a varying extension according to the universities, but if these universities intend to develop them, it would be necessary to open them up more to internationl co-operation. Taking into account especially the integration of certain European economies, we can imagine that certain executives, engineers, managers, etc. will wish to "recycle" themselves or improve their training in another country of the Region. Perhaps, certain industrial or commercial firms have workshops abroad for certain categories of their personnel and inside their own structures. Nonetheless, these universities, in the different perspectives which are particular to them, should perhaps also take part in these exchanges.

III. OBSTACLES AND HINDRANCES TO STUDENT EXCHANGES : A FEW SUGGESTIONS TO SURMOUNT THEM

1. *ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES*

According to the majority of the responses to the questionnaire, economic difficulties constitute the main obstacle to the development of student exchanges or even to keeping them at the present level. Now, these difficulties are at work at all levels : at the student level, at the institutional level, and at the governmental level.

a) At the level of the *students*, the economic difficulties and especially the difficulty of employment, seem to have an unambiguous dissuasive effect. The general climate invites them to pursue profitable courses of study, that is, more or less demanded on the labour market,

and to make them profitable as quickly as possible, that is, without incurring losses of time and eventually of money which periods of study abroad can bring about (without speaking of the risks of the non-recognition of their diploma in their countries, if they pursue a complete programme of study in another country). Moreover, Turkey, for example, points out that the students, upon their return, must "serve" in a State institution with a very low salary, which hardly encourages studies abroad. We shall return later to the question of the recognition of diplomas ; what should be retained here is the economic uncertainty and the more or less widespread intimidation effect which it can have.

One could have thought that it would be compensated by another secondary — and opposite — effect of unemployment or underemployment. Without statistical data at our disposal in this regard, it is generally agreed, in fact, that a certain number of students go or stay at the university because they cannot find a job or even because they do not hope to find a high paying one. It is in this sense that we speak of "university parking". What we can wonder is why the students who prolong their studies in this way do not profit from it by completing their education abroad. Perhaps they are often poorly informed of the possibilities : it has been already said that certain available scholarships are not used. Perhaps also it is a question of students who are little motivated by intellectual curiosity, even though nothing permits us to affirm that the backing off in front of mediocre jobs is necessarily symptomatic of a lack of open-mindedness. Perhaps we should also keep in mind the fact that the relative democratization of the access to higher education has assured the university a greater proportion of students coming from milieux which are less in the habit of thinking in terms of education abroad. Nevertheless, these are mere conjectures.

In order to attempt to improve this situation, we can suggest first of all that efforts should be made to better *inform* students of the possibilities of study abroad. Numerous universities have a section or person responsible for international co-operation. It would be important to provide them with sufficient means to collect and distribute the information, for example, through information centres on co-operation and study abroad.

Then, every time it seems possible, it would be advisable that the scholarships granted to national students be *transferable* to other countries, at least under certain conditions. A certain number of Western European countries, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, for example, have taken measures in this direction. Between the socialist countries, where the vast majority of students are scholarship holders and where the exchanges are very organized, the question is not posed in the same terms ; on the basis of reciprocity, the students are normally assured of the necessary financial facilities. Likewise, we can hope for reciprocity in the social advantages (food, medical care, etc.) accorded to the students. This reciprocity seems, moreover, rather generally assured. France and the Federal Republic of Germany have gone rather far in this direction, creating a franco-german card of university services which is usable in the two countries.

Finally, it must be pointed out that the agreements from university to university facilitate the taking into account of partial studies leading to a diploma and limit the risks of studies abroad. In certain cases, they facilitate settling the question of the study rights, a question that we will come back to.

b) On the level of the *universities*, it is evident that the exchanges of persons entail costs, be it only for travelling or for administration, even when they are reciprocal. It is thus hoped that they can find special funds for co-operation from their governments or international institutions. This leads us to the following point.

c) On the level of *governments*, there is no denying that receiving foreign students is expensive, especially when it is not based on reciprocal exchanges. To assure this reciprocity and to thus improve mobility, certain countries recommended the multiplication of bilateral cultural agreements providing for the granting of scholarships. In difficult economic conditions which many countries are experiencing now, nonetheless, the temptation can be great to grant priority to national students in the allocation of resources and thus to adopt restrictive measures toward foreign students. These measures are for the most part of an administrative and legal order, and they will be examined in the following point.

The planning of studies which is indispensable in the socialist states is connected with economic obstacles. Thus, Romania points out that the main problems which are encountered concerning sending its national students in other countries of the Europe Region are linked to the existence of disciplines of study which present a particular interest for the socio-economic development of the country.

2. *LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE OBSTACLES*

It might be said perhaps that there is some artifice in distinguishing this category of obstacles from economic obstacles from which they are largely derived. It must be pointed out, however, that whatever the weight of the financial factors, other considerations can also motivate more or less restrictive practices, especially political considerations. We have already observed that co-operation was generally more intense between countries with comparable socio-political systems ; the question of visas, rules relative to immigration and stay of foreigners, etc. obey considerations which are not exclusively of an economic order. After all, we must count with the weight of history, habits, inertias characteristic of each country, which, in the past may have led to the establishment of barriers for which we no longer see the raison d'être and which, however, we allow to continue. It is perhaps the case of certain rigidity which existed until some time ago concerning the recognition of diplomas, and it is not sure that all rigidity has disappeared in spite of the real progress which has been recorded during the recent period.

a) *Mutual recognition of diplomas*

This question has remained in suspense for a long time. We will not retrace the history of the question here and we shall evoke only to refresh your memory the numerous cultural agreements concluded since

the second half of the 19th century and containing, on the "equivalences", clauses which often remained a dead letter.

On the multilateral plan, a new departure has been effected in Europe, a few years after the end of the Second World War, by the Council of Europe, under the aegis of which three conventions have been concluded, on the equivalence of diplomas granting access to university institutions (1953), on the equivalence of university periods (1956), and on the academic recognition of university qualifications (1950). Certain countries declared that they use these conventions as the basis for their policy of recognition of diplomas delivered in the other Member States of the Council. But beyond their practical range (they furnish especially a general framework inside which detailed decisions remain to be taken), the Conventions have undoubtedly had a considerable political weight. They have marked a wish for co-operation in an area which had remained rigid for a long time and which could be animated only by a political choice of the interested parties. This political willingness for co-operation exists also between the countries of socialist Europe, where the problems of mutual recognition do not seem to pose any major difficulties and which have signed a convention in Prague in 1972.

Article 57 of the Treaty of Rome, from which the European Communities came forth, also stipulates in general terms measures of mutual recognition destined to facilitate the exercise of the right of free establishment for the non-salaried professors. Furthermore, the States of the Nordic Council have also signed a Convention on equivalence in 1975.

Finally, in December 1979, under the aegis of Unesco, the Member States of the Europe Region have signed an important Convention on the recognition of studies and diplomas relative to higher education. This Convention is registered in a series of regional conventions for which Unesco took the initiative and which innovate by introducing, for example, the notion of "stages of education" conceived more as possible points of departure for more advanced study than as points of arrival, consecrating certain acquired knowledge, and foreseeing outside of the diploma strictly speaking, other individual competences attested by other means (professional experience, publication of works, etc.). The Convention foresees also the establishing of various national mechanisms and a regional Council which will apply the Convention. That is a very important point and the practical scope of the Convention will depend in a large measure on the work of these bodies. They should at least permit the systematic exchange of information and the dissipation of misunderstanding which can come about from the diversity of systems. We can hope that these misunderstandings due to insufficient information will be progressively eliminated.

We must, moreover, recognize that the evolution is going in this direction. We have seen that the Conventions signed under the aegis of international organizations had probably contributed to thawing the situation. At the same time, bilateral arrangements, sometimes detailed, were especially made, as was already shown, between France and the Federal Republic of Germany. It is perhaps also significant that France, which was characterized not long ago by a very restrictive ruling in this

area, has laxened its procedures very considerably, the decision concerning the recognition of diplomas being for the essential part the responsibility of the president of each university. That goes in the direction of increasing university autonomy desired by the reform of 1968, but could as well be symptomatic of a relief in tension in the matter. France thus joins the countries which, traditionally, leave the universities free to make their own decisions : the United States, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, etc.

It is further interesting to note that even in countries where individual universities make their own decisions concerning the recognition of foreign diplomas, central bodies try to help them by providing them with information on these diplomas or by helping foreign students by giving them information on the recognition granted to their diploma. Almost all member countries of the Council of Europe, such as the United Kingdom for example, have national centres of information on the equivalences. The Institute of International Education of New York also has at its disposal considerable documentation and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada has instituted a similar service. These central bodies have the advantage of introducing a minimum amount of forecasting in the matter and provide foreign students with the possibility of knowing the level of recognition which they can hope to obtain. In the absence of precise rules, a sort of customary law which is not very imperious seems to become established. The danger is perhaps that certain rigidity of judgment risks to be reintroduced and certain errors of appreciation perpetuated. Hypothetical or real danger ? It is very difficult to judge.

Other countries (for example Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, the socialist countries) codify more explicitly, by legislative or regulating means and on the basis or not of bilateral or multilateral agreements, their system of "equivalences" or of recognition of foreign diplomas. For the students as for the universities, such a codification has merits for clearness : everyone knows, in principle, what to expect. On the other hand, it facilitates organized and planned co-operation such as it is practiced, especially, between the countries of socialist Europe. Moreover, it must be pointed out that a codified system is not necessarily a restrictive system and can in principle forecast equivalences in a liberal way. However, it limits the margin of appreciation of the universities and perhaps makes the evaluation of students more difficult when factors other than strictly academic ones are taken into account.

An interesting development is the conferral of a double diploma (one from country X and the other from country Y) at the end of joint programmes of studies between two institutions of countries X and Y, a schema encouraged, it is known, by the European Economic Community (EEC). This is a practice which is still limited but which could perhaps be developed.

b) *Administrative and financial modalities of receiving foreign students*

Certain countries, like France, Portugal, or Romania, note a very sensitive increase in the number of foreign students which they have received during recent years. However, the financial difficulties which

have already been noted and, in certain cases, lack of buildings, of equipment, or of personnel leads if not to a reversal of the trend, at least to measures intended to arrest or slow down the process. More stress is placed, for example, on a good previous knowledge of the language of the receiving country. France, for example, has very recently taken measures to centralize the language examinations which foreign students must take as part of the so-called pre-registration procedure. But other countries also note explicit language requirements (Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Greece, the German Democratic Republic), and certain countries as will be seen, organize special courses to permit foreigners to satisfy them. It is obviously absurd to claim to take advanced courses in a language one does not know, but it is certain also that language examinations can serve as means of regulating the numbers of students and thus serve to ends other than the strict verification of minimal knowledge which is recognized as necessary.

Another dissuasive instrument is the often very sensitive collection of fees required of foreign students (as compared to the national students). We know that this is the policy adopted, in particular, by the United Kingdom, in spite of the criticism which it has brought up within the universities themselves. It is to be further noted that, in the case of organized and reciprocal exchanges, the universities forego rather often the special scale of fees for foreigners. Again, interuniversity agreements provide possibilities which are refused to the free movement of students.

A measure practiced by certain countries is, if we can say, a double edged sword : it consists in apportioning the number of foreign students, or attributing a quota to them, which can vary according to the area of study. This is what Denmark does, for example. According to the number of national candidates for such or such a discipline, an apportionment can put foreigners in a more unfavourable or a more favourable position than the Danes. The fixing of quotas can in fact be analysed either as a limit or a ceiling or as a reserving of a certain number of places for foreign students. This is what happens in the Federal Republic of Germany in the case of fields access to which is limited by a *numerus clausus* but where a certain number of places (up to 8%) must be reserved for foreigners. In fact, it happens very often that this quota is not fully used. The Grandes Ecoles of France, which recruit through entrance examinations and where the number of places is strictly limited, also reserve a certain number for foreigners.

It must be added that the apportionments are often more rigorous for certain types of studies than for others. Medicine, dental medicine, and pharmacy are in general more jealously guarded than other areas of study : 5% of the places for foreigners in France (whereas the percentage of foreigners for the whole of education surpasses 12%) and 6% in the Federal Republic of Germany. Likewise, Switzerland and Canada impose restrictive measures in these areas. Ireland sees itself forced to prohibit foreigners' access to its professional training programmes because of the influx of national students. In other countries like Switzerland (and it is well worth mentioning that it accepts a high number of foreign stu-

dents), professional diplomas have a purely academic value and do not confer the right to practice the profession. This right can in fact be acquired only after taking special examinations which, in certain protected areas, are not accessible to foreigners.

It must be further noted that the existence of a *numerus clausus* in certain countries sometimes determines a rush of national students who leave these countries for other countries of the Region which do not impose the same limits. Such is the case of Austria, for example, or of Spain which counts numerous students in medicine from other countries of Europe, although no financial aid is granted them.

We have already mentioned the question of entry visas required by certain countries, and of stay licences. We must also mention here the question of work permits which foreign students may need in order to finance their studies when they do not have other sufficient resources. Now, obtaining these permits can be almost impossible (Switzerland) or in any case rather difficult (France, the United States, etc.). Unemployment which is rampant in a large part of the Europe Region brings on almost fatally protectionist work measures for the benefit of the nationals or, possibly, for those leaving a limited community of countries (EEC), and it can only be hoped that the responsible authorities will adopt a more flexible policy in favour of students — or increase the number of scholarships and other financial aid. In the period of crisis which many countries are going through, it is perhaps asking a lot. At least, it is important to contain as much as possible the erosionary effect which a continuing inflation has on the value of scholarships. Finally, many of the funds destined to the payment of scholarships have not kept up with the amount of the scholarships. To take a rather eloquent example, the number of scholarships offered to foreigners in the Fulbright-Hayes programme (United States of America) had to be reduced by half in the period of a few years because of inflation. We add here the economic difficulties which have been seen to be underlying most of the other obstacles to student mobility.

3. *CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC OBSTACLES*

In appearance, this category of obstacles is more independent from economic factors than the other categories discussed so far. It will be seen, however, that there is no complete independence with respect to economic aspects even if this category of obstacles results from more vast and more complex phenomena.

For those who come from other Regions, it can appear peculiar to speak of cultural obstacles to the mobility of students within the European area, even enlarged to the dimensions which Unesco gives it. Here is in fact a cultural ensemble which is of course extremely rich and varied but which feeds itself on common sources which do not stop modeling mentalities : the judeo-biblical culture, Greco-Roman antiquity, Christianity which has inherited from one and the other, the philosophies which arose from it in order to comfort it or to combat it, the Renaissance, the scientific adventure inaugurated in the 17th century, the age of reason, the great literatures, the great schools of painting, the great music which

became the undivided patrimony of the majority of European nations, the industrial revolution and the soar of technology, a lively history which contributed to the making of the European peoples, here are so many powerful elements which combine to define an incontestable cultural unity which underlies and magnetizes all of its variants. It makes sense to speak of a Northern European culture, a Mediterranean European culture, a central European culture, all of which espouse the contours of a very broken up, diversified space, speckled by a dense network of national and linguistic boundaries. What can be said is perhaps that the common core should be able to provide to each, given a certain level of education, something with which to understand and taste the different parts of the whole. Finally, even if we must not neglect certain apparently secondary factors but which often generate removal more than high culture, the main cultural obstacle to student mobility in Europe is linguistic. Europe is certainly privileged in the sense that it is the birth-place of most of the great languages of scentific and cultural communication, but it does not draw from this privilege all that it can.

This is certainly a situation which eludes the university for a large part and which depends on the school system, indeed on the ensemble of social structures. Many people remain allergic to foreign languages, often for lack of having received early language training.

In many cases, only school can remedy this situation, and for the children who live in massively monolingual places, it would perhaps be better to have linguistic training which is as "motivating" as possible in primary school, then to assure solid training in foreign languages in the secondary school. It is interesting to note, in this respect, that in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries there are schools which carry on their teaching in a foreign language (with the exception, of course, of the national language and literature).

As for the universities, they could opportunely relay this effort by putting, for example, as certain do, training and language laboratories at the disposal of the students whose specialty is not languages.

But inversely — and this is very important — they can organize foreign students courses in the language which they use. In the Soviet Union, for example, most of the foreign students, before starting their studies, strictly speaking, go through a "preparatory faculty" where they receive intensive Russian training and, if the need arises, complementary training in the disciplines which are fundamental to their future speciality. The same applies in other socialist countries such as Romania and Bulgaria, which has created a special Institute for Foreign Students.

The case of Bulgaria is interesting in that it illustrates well the problem which is found in countries where the language has only low international diffusion. That is another "injustice" due to history and geography, which are, moreover, prodigal. The culture and the language of "small" countries are seldom studied elsewhere unless they are attached to more vast linguistic units (the case of Switzerland, for example). When the universities of these countries receive foreign students, they are very often obliged to offer them language training starting from a point close to zero knowledge. It is very difficult to find a truly successful remedy

to this situation, but we can hope that the "large" European countries will lend more attentive interest to those whose language is less spread. A possibility would be to enlarge the range of languages proposed in secondary school (if only it were in only a few institutions) in order to permit at least a small number of pupils to study and to be examined in one of these languages which have a restricted diffusion. Certain pupils among them could thus systematize and capitalize on the more or less empirical knowledge which they can have in one of these languages, through family relations or others. It is to be pointed out that in France, for example, it is possible to present at the baccalaureat examination a rather large choice of languages, European or not.

We took the example of Bulgaria, but we could have, of course, chosen others. In the same geographic region of Europe, the Greek universities require of foreign students a good knowledge of Greek, and they organize like their Turkish neighbours courses to this effect. At the other end of the continent, the Scandinavian countries indicate also the limited diffusion of their language as a major barrier to receiving foreign students — although Finland organizes special courses for them.

Note, however, that the universities of certain countries, the language or languages of which enjoy a rather broad diffusion, offer, nonetheless, special training to students who wish to study there. This is the case with Switzerland, for example, with its courses on the introduction to Swiss university studies and its summer language courses, the case of Canada (English and French), and that of the Federal Republic of Germany with its *Studienkollegen*. The summer courses, which are rather widespread, seem to be suitable mostly to the perfection of language skills. Finally, mention must be made of the existence in certain countries of large bodies which, outside the universities, also assure language training at all levels : the Alliance française, for example, the British Council, or the Goethe Institut. At least for the most widespread languages, students have a rather vast range of possibilities of language training at their disposal. Still they must be urged to use them, and there we find the problem of becoming sensitive, early if possible, to foreign languages.

Mastery of the language is the first condition for access and adaptation to the life of a country. In spite of the relative homogeneity and, in many other regards, the growing homogeneization of European culture and life styles, this mastery is not always enough, nonetheless, to prevent homesickness, isolation, or marginalization which students in a foreign country can suffer from. Thus, the universities or the authorities of a number of countries provide special *receiving structures* for foreign students. These structures can take on different forms and concern various areas, from lodging problems to problems of intellectual adaptation and to cultural needs. Sometimes we find offices or special departments (France), and sometimes also we find a high ranking university person — a dean for example, in countries like Canada or the United States — who is in charge of receiving foreign students. We can only show approval of such arrangements and the concern for university hospitality which they bear witness to. Perhaps, nonetheless, it would not be appro-

priate to push too far this special treatment granted to foreign students, which, at the extreme, would risk cutting them off from the society inside which they have come to live.

IV. A FEW CONCLUSIONS

Does the brief summary of a few of the trends of student mobility in the Europe Region permit some conclusions ? Certain signs allow us to think that we are witnessing a certain change in this area.

The old tradition of free circulation and of studious wandering, the indispensable corollary of which is, on the side of the universities the tradition of receiving students wherever they come from, is not dead. Faithful to its tradition, certain universities — in Italy, in Spain, for example — accept even to bear more or less the costs of the measures of *numerus clausus* taken in other countries, most especially in medicine, and to absorb a part of the glut of students which results. The question is to know if this situation, which is in all truthfulness, abnormal, could be maintained for a long time and if limiting rules are not imposed soon. However, it is necessary to recognize that measures have also been recently taken to favour an informal mobility which aims more at education, strictly speaking, than its sanction, that is the diploma. Thus, Denmark recently created a new category of "student-guests" who are foreign students who come to Denmark for one or two years to complete their education, who enjoy the same facilities as the other students while being able to register more easily, but who do not have the right to receive a Danish diploma. Even in the countries where this category does not exist, it is not rare that advanced foreign students come to spend a year or even two in a university, solely to complete their education or possibly to write a thesis, but without trying to obtain a diploma.

Obviously, we can only hope for the continuation, indeed the renewal of these traditions which are at the same time liberal and hospitable, but we must admit that the present period is not very favourable to them. With the massive increase of university students during the last decades, the problems have changed scale and they have been recently aggravated by the diminishing resources and the employment difficulties which affect numerous countries. It is a truism to say that we are in the era of organization, of management, of strict accountability. More than in the past, the students themselves wish to manage their studies and their study-time, and we have seen that they are more hesitant than not long ago to take risks with free mobility. On the other hand, governments and university administrations have been brought to require more transparency in the utilization of resources and to measure the means toward strictly defined goals. Finally, the employers themselves, for the most part, tend to valorize more studies made in the framework of precise programmes, agreed to by two institutions and guaranteed by their double label. Thus, we can wonder if the return to student mobility in the Europe Region is not passing through an intensification of exchanges

organized and structured by precise agreements between universities, whether they be capped or not by intergovernmental conventions and passed or not with the co-operation of third party international organizations (EEC, for example) or national organizations (the British Council, DAAD, Ministry, etc.). It stands to reason, however, that such arguments have value only if they are really applied and exist other than on paper, that is to say, if there are inside interested universities, responsible persons who are determined to become devoted to it, preferably, if they truly participate in a university policy, centered on scientific, pedagogical, or other options common to the institutions in question.

3

CO-OPERATION REGARDING TEACHERS

The boundary is tenuous, inside the University between advanced students and teachers. Assistants, for example, are most often both students and teachers at the same time, and teachers are in some way lifetime students, even if they do not have that status and even if they try to separate and organize new knowledge instead of limiting themselves to assimilating knowledge acquired and systematized by others. It remains, however, that if the problems of student and teacher mobility have a common fringe (that of assistants), they are not identical. The direction of movement, for example, is often inverse : when a country desires either to help or to influence another country culturally, it tends to receive students from the latter country and to send teachers to it. Inside the Europe Region, nonetheless, these questions of assistance and of keeping zones of cultural influence are hardly posed, or are posed only under conditions of reciprocity, which is at least relative, without being falsified by the flagrant dissymmetry of the situations. For the same reasons, if the problem of the "exodus of brains" has not always been completely absent from the Region, considering the attraction exerted by the universities of the United States, it has never borne anything but a limited character and has never really threatened to deprive a country of its intellectual substance. Finally, the conditions of relative equality which prevail between the countries considered determine that none of the countries truly needs to follow a policy of "nationalization" of the university teachers in order to conquer or to preserve its cultural identity or to assure a true symbiosis between the university and the nation.

Thus, exempt of numerous thorny problems which are posed elsewhere, the mobility of teachers in the Region should be facilitated by an old tradition which nationalism has certainly tended to smother during the contemporary period but which perhaps has not died out entirely. It will be seen that France has recently taken measures to facilitate the recruitment of foreign teachers, but until this recent date, a university

career had been ever since the 19th century reserved practically only for French citizens who alone were able to become civil servants, and there was a striking contrast between the considerable number of foreign writers and artists who lived in Paris and the almost complete absence of non-French university staff who would have been installed permanently. However, even in the countries where there were no unsurmountable legal obstacles to the employment of foreign university teachers, the situation was not fundamentally different, at least in a normal period. At the most difficult and sometimes most dramatic moments, nonetheless, it seems that the old traditions of receiving were ready to come to life again. The most striking example, in contemporary history, was perhaps the hospitality given by numerous universities, especially in the United States, to German university teachers who had fled Nazi Germany. We know, furthermore, that this German contribution was a considerable enrichment for the American universities and that it was perhaps one of the causes of their remarkable flourishing after the war — which shows the importance of migrations of learned men and the effects of mutual fertilization which can result. At a more recent date, numerous universities of the Europe Region have made real efforts to give work possibilities to colleagues who are forced to become exiles from their countries (often located outside the Region). This policy of asylum can only be hoped to continue, but also it is hoped that it will become less and less necessary. However, even if this optimistic hypothesis becomes real, the international mobility of university teachers would keep a stake which can be judged very important if it is believed that the international university community can still constitute one of the resources of peace in the world — a vast influential group in favour of mutual comprehension of men and societies or of simple intellectual integrity in the analysis and the solution of conflicts. Even if such a community can appear rather weak in front of great political and economic apparatus, we must not neglect the possibilities that it can offer, and thus, we must strengthen it as much as possible. From this point of view, international mobility of teachers is essential, and it must be promoted.

However, even more than that of students, the mobility of teachers is difficult to characterize. Co-operation between teachers can take the form of a visit to the laboratory of a colleague during some trip, of incidental conversations during a convention, of the exchange of letters or telephone calls, or simply of the mutual reading of published works. Its real level is in fact impossible to judge, and the answers to the questionnaire naturally do not abound in precise statistical data. To this can be added that certain forms of co-operation, albeit visible and discernable, are not counted as such. There are disciplines, for example, which almost by nature, involve field trips abroad : archeology, geology, ethnology, geography, etc. In fact every scientific and, consequently, pedagogical enterprise is of a co-operative nature and it is often extremely difficult to say where co-operation starts or stops. We shall retain here that which involves transfer of persons, which we shall try to classify according to mainly temporal criteria.

I. SOME TYPES OF TEACHER MOBILITY

1) *Short term missions*

It happens, of course, that university teachers passing in a country can be asked by one or several universities to give a lecture or two. This is episodic and occasional co-operation which will not be taken into account here, given the lack of precise data on its extent. Numerous interuniversity (or interfaculty) agreements, on the other hand provide for regular exchanges of teachers, most often of a short duration (from a few days to a few weeks) : the time to give a few courses (indeed, only one), to conduct a seminar, to take stock with colleagues on such and such a question, to study a particular point. Often also, teachers go abroad for short information and documentation missions or to participate in international colloquia or seminars. The latter tend to multiply ; it is a form of mobility which tends to intensify. It is most often financed by the universities themselves, but sometimes also, totally or partially, by international organizations, learned societies, etc. which organize or sponsor these meetings. When the exchanges take place under cultural or interuniversity agreements they can, as we have seen, receive special financing. Again, it is rather difficult to get an idea of the numerical extent of these short term movements in the whole of the Region. The Ukrainian SSR, however, indicates that during 1976—1979, 1,012 Ukrainian teachers went abroad for relatively brief missions and that an equal number of foreign teachers have made similar stays in the Ukraine.

Still on the subject of relatively short exchanges, it must be pointed out that the universities of several countries of the Region organize during the summer improvement courses in the national language for foreign teachers. It must also be pointed out that certain missions provide for longer durations, even up to one semester. The German Office of University Exchanges organizes study visits up to four months (750 persons in 1979). Switzerland indicates on the other hand, that a certain number of its teachers have permanent contracts to give brief series of courses or to assure consultation services in foreign universities, those of the Federal Republic of Germany, for example.

2) *Missions of limited duration, but regular or recurrent*

The case of the Swiss teachers which we have just cited, constitutes a first illustration of this type of mobility. Going a little further, we find also the case of teachers who share their time more or less equally between two universities in different countries, sometimes located on the two sides of the Atlantic. This case is not the object of a special treatment in the answers to the questionnaire. Perhaps it is relatively rare, and it concerns people with a great reputation. It would, however, be interesting to know more about the number of persons thus assuring a double service.

A case which is a little different but still similar, is presented by certain teachers from universities bound by agreements and which, for example, have joint programmes. Each year, in regular or recurring

fashion, these teachers spend a part of their time with students of the partner university, whether that involves a displacement of students or of teachers themselves.

Such regular exchanges permit evidently a deeper, more systematic co-operation, and a better mutual knowledge of the parties concerned bound by a feeling of common belonging. We must not neglect the scope of shorter and more episodic transfers. Beside the scientific or pedagogical benefits that the participants can draw from them, they contribute to internationalizing the university milieu, to make of it a field of movements and exchanges, and to multiplying contacts between persons of different nationalities.

3) *Missions of long duration, career abroad*

By missions of long duration, we understand, arbitrarily perhaps, a mission of an academic year or longer and which can consist or not of detachment from the original university. Certain teachers can choose or be forced (for political reasons, for example) to spend a part of or even their whole career abroad without maintaining links with a university in their own country. The case is not rare in certain German speaking countries (the Federal Republic of Germany and German speaking Switzerland, for example), but other examples can be found in the universities of North America where numerous European university teachers have made their careers, even if the movement seems to have slowed down for some years. Recently, as we have just indicated, a number of European universities have received political refugies or exiles who have or have not come from countries of the Region. Beside this particular case, prolonged stays abroad seem more frequent for language teachers.

Still, these prolonged stays must be legally or administratively possible, and this question leads us to the examination of the obstacles and the measures which encourage the mobility of teachers.

II. OBSTACLES AND INCENTIVES

1) *Economic-financial obstacles*

It is difficult to establish a diagnosis based really on the recent evolution of the mobility of teachers in Europe because contradictory testimony is involved in this regard. In the socialist countries, where exchanges are essentially regulated by precise agreements, we do not have the impression that co-operation is suffering a crisis, and the answers to the questionnaire lead us to think that it is developing regularly.

In other countries, we can suppose that the crisis of means which affects almost all of the universities also has its repercussions on this aspect of university co-operation, especially when exchanges are made by informal understandings and are not binding through the contractual law of agreements. Numerous responses to the questionnaire underline, moreover, that the principal obstacle to its development is financial. While the resources of the universities become less, we see, for example, a considerable increase in numerous air fares. Furthermore, inflation

erodes the funds which are earmarked for certain grants destined for teachers who wish to go abroad, one of which is the famous Fulbright grant of the United States. We know, moreover, that many of the universities of this country have to cope sometimes with dramatic difficulties which do not spare even the largest or the most reputed schools. Several consequences derive from this situation, some of which go beyond the simple lack of funds to pay such and such a trip and which are of an economic order, in the broad sense, as well as financial. Universities recruit fewer new teachers — and this is not a phenomenon peculiar to the United States — but also certain university jobs appear threatened. In these conditions, it is normal that teachers union and public power pressure the universities to give preference to the nationals in their recruitment policy. In the end, that can only be translated by a progressive "nationalization" of the teaching corps, a phenomenon which numerous responsible American university officials deplore. A similar situation is found in Canada and perhaps, in a more or less accentuated form, in many other countries. Even where the universities are in principle sovereign in the matter of the recruitment of their personnel, their freedom of action is sometimes limited by the increasing unionization of the personnel and by public power which, through the action of the relation relative to immigration, to the granting of visas or all kinds of permits, has the means to influence the situation. This can lead us to examine a second category of obstacles.

2) *Legal-administrative obstacles and the measures to overcome them*

We must recognize that in many countries, public power has resisted the temptation to impose restrictive measures and that certain countries have made efforts to abolish the ones that have been introduced. What has been said can temper the pessimism of the preceding remarks. A very characteristic example is that of France where, still not long ago, access to the university teaching corps was very difficult for foreigners, in particular because they could not become civil servants of the State. The French answer to the questionnaire will permit us to examine rather in detail this characteristic case. Decrees of 1976 permit henceforth the recruitment and the tenure of foreign persons as professors or "lecturers", which constitutes a notable derogation of the status of French civil servants. These persons preserve their nationality but have the same rights and the same duties as their French colleagues. We thus find a situation somehow similar to the one prevailing in certain countries where the teaching position, although treated as civil service, is accessible to foreigners because of a special derogatory statute.

On the other hand, a decree of 1978 permits the recruitment of foreigners, without regard to grade nor to nationality, as "associate" teachers (for one year renewable up to four years) or "invited" teachers (for a length of three months maximum). During the academic year 1978—1979, there were 310 associate teachers, of which 246 from Western Europe and 64 from Eastern Europe, mainly in the field of the pure sciences. Moreover, there were 598 European lecturers of foreign languages, of which 504 came from Western Europe and the rest from

Eastern Europe. Memoranda from the Ministry of universities (of 1976 and 1977) have, moreover, simplified the regulation concerning immigration and the issue of work cards for foreign teachers.

Inversely, measures have been taken to facilitate the missions of French university teachers abroad. They have the right to authorized leave for six weeks a year, or twelve weeks for two years, without reduction in salary and with possible payment of per-diem. For missions of long duration, there exists a seconding procedure for a period of four years renewable permitting teachers to keep their position in their original university during their absence. Finally, a decree of 1978 has provided a rather flexible procedure for taking leaves for varying durations. The answer to the questionnaire specifies that, in spirit, this measure is close to the sabbatical year but that it is too recent to be able to judge the effects.

Other countries have taken similar measures, especially Finland. Regulations of 1975 provide that teachers wishing to go abroad can conclude a contract with the Ministry of Education which continues to assure payment of 70% of their salary, the balance being paid by the receiving university. Inversely, the Finnish government offers certain facilities to visiting foreign teachers : lodging, travel and moving expenses, free medical care. Such examples can be multiplied. In the socialist countries, as we have underlined, exchanges are carefully organized and the Unkrainian SSR, for example, indicates that the teachers who go abroad continue to receive their entire salary and receive, besides, a per-diem.

There are, of course, countries, mainly those with a decentralized university tradition, where there exists no legislation or national regulation to facilitate the movement of teachers by granting them certain guarantees (of salary, of reintegration for example). Belgium indicates that, for the time being, it is difficult for its teachers to leave their posts for long or short periods because, according to the terms of the present legislation, it is not possible to continue to pay their salaries and to assure them other rights. This legislation is, nonetheless, felt as excessively rigid and efforts have been taken to modify it.

In other countries, moreover, there exist large bodies which try to promote university exchanges and, in particular, of teachers. A typical example is the British Council and another, the German Office of University Exchanges *(Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst)* which indicates an increase in the persons interested by its teacher exchange programmes (325 in 1979) or study trips (750 in the same year). In addition, certain universities of certain countries (the United Kingdom, for example) have a policy of periodical sabbaticals which is to stimulate the mobility of teachers. In Switzerland, a third of the teachers are foreigners, and this is considered as a ferment of academic life.

We can thus believe that if this mobility is in regression, because of the crisis, in certain countries of the Region, it remains, for the time being, stable or even tends to progress in others. In any case, it is not hindered in these last countries by a more restrictive policy on behalf of the authorities on the contrary. It may be that, in certain cases, the effects of the crisis, which is rather general, are compensated by the

tendencies toward integration or toward economic and political co-operation : in (geographical) Western Europe and in the socialist countries, for example.

3) *Linguistic obstacles*

We can, however, believe that efforts remain to be made. A certain impermeability subsists between the national university systems, which is perhaps due in part to linguistic obstacles which we have already had the opportunity to examine in the discussion of students, but which also exists in the case of teachers, as Bulgaria, for example, emphasizes, while presenting systematic efforts which it is making to surmount them.

At first sight, nonetheless, these obstacles are less serious when it concerns teachers and, in the field of the pure and natural sciences especially, we witness the emergence, at least in the non-socialist countries, of a more and more exclusive recourse to an international language of scientific communication : English under the circumstances. It is not a secret to anyone that even in countries which have a strong scientific tradition, the Federal Republic of Germany or France, for example, rather numerous scientists prefer to publish their work or write their papers directly in English in order to assure them the widest public.

We can hope, nonetheless, that, in all areas of science, and especially in the social and human sciences, the different national languages will keep their vitality and their creativity. We can also hope that the university teachers going to foreign countries for missions of whatever duration will endeavour to learn their language instead of passing through the filter of a third language. A world where what can be called "linguistic types" would become fewer like vegetable and animal species, would be a culturally impoverished world.

4) *Pedagogical obstacles*

It can be argued that persons who have grown up in a given school system, who have a thorough knowledge of its methods and mental habits, are better suited to teach students who, like them, come from the same background. There is perhaps some truth in this assertion, but it is no less true that habits become easily routines which must be shaken by different and, in some cases, disconcerting approaches which can be those of foreign teachers trained in other systems. There is no education without multiple interaction, and what is important is to succeed, if we can say, in achieving the best dosage possible between national and foreign teachers.

It remains that too frequent transfers of teachers risk being translated into a certain professional absenteeism and thus into a perturbation of the ordered flow of education, especially where the law or regulations do not permit provision of replacements for a relatively short duration, as is the case in certain countries, one of which is Spain. Even certain socialist countries like Romania, where exchanges of teachers are regulated by bilateral agreements, attract attention to this problem. After all, everything, even the best, has its cost — financial, social, pedagogical, etc. — and, there still, the essential is to regulate the exchanges and

trips of teachers in such a manner that the students profit from it in the whole more than they suffer. This is a balance which is, of course, difficult to establish.

III. A FEW CONCLUSIONS

"To work in the country", such seems to be in our days the claim of numerous categories of persons who do not refuse to travel during their free leisure time, but who refuse to install themselves, if it can be said, to uproot themselves. Traditionally rather mobile, attracted toward the great poles of university life, are teachers equally seized by this need of stability ? It is difficult to answer this question, but France, for example, indicates that its university teachers seem more reticent than several years ago to accept long term missions abroad and prefer moving for a short time, this in spite of certain guarantees of keeping their posts, which was mentioned above. Perhaps this reticence is explained, in large measure, by career considerations. In many countries, university carrers develop in fact in such a manner that it is not enough to "keep" a post, it must be actively occupied, in the eyes of the national university community, make its work known, become a member of the team, cultivate relations. Of course, such a necessity is less pressing for teachers who have already acquired an international reputation and whose prestige can be further enhanced by missions in renowned foreign universities. The Europe of Unesco is, furthermore, even there, privileged. A teacher risks less from cutting himself from his home university than if he accepts to expatriate himself to such and such a country in the Third World where the possibilities of research and publication are more limited. It remains that numerous teachers hesitate, it seems, to run the risk of taking themselves out of circulation for a more or less prolonged length of time from the university community where they expect a promotion or simply the possiblity of working under good conditions on problems which interest them the most.

If such is indeed the case, several elements of a solution can be envisioned.

In the first place we can think that these reluctances could be attenuated if the European university community were in reality more present and more alive, where the work done abroad was more easily perceived first and then recognized. If need be, understandings on the regulation of careers could be envisioned, especially between countries anxious to establish close co-operation.

Nonetheless, this is a far cry from considering the problem solved because there still have to be found the means of invigorating the European university community. Now, interuniversity agreements, provided that they are well conceived and applied, constitute perhaps one of the most efficient means. Exchanges can then be regulated in such a manner so as not to disturb the running of the educational process and even if teachers spend a part of their time in the partner university, they continue to be integrated in their home university and do not risk

being "forgotten", especially when the two universities have truly common projects (of teaching or research).

Another means of stimulating co-operation would perhaps be to multiply in the universities the multidisciplinary study centres of a country or a group of countries of the Region. Co-operation will succeed or bear fruit only if it corresponds to a need, and it seems that this is a true need. It is a fact that the countries of the Region often know themselves only imperfectly or in a fragmentary fashion. There exist, of course, in universities, numerous departments of foreign languages and literatures, but still few centres which are charged to study all aspects of the life of a country (or group of countries) : its history, its geography, its economy, its sociology, etc. Such centres could propose to students either complete programmes of study or complementary and specialization programmes, and they would obviously have to call, at least partially, on specialists from the country studied : economists, historians, etc. Moreover, these centres could be created or managed jointly by two or several universities of different countries. Regular and concerted exchanges of teachers could thus take place, teams would be constituted, and the general climate of co-operation would be reinforced by it.

Of course, still, the possibilities are relatively limited, and it is hardly realistic to envision the creation of such centres in each university for the study of all countries of the Region. A certain distribution of tasks should be effected, but it is perhaps a direction which would be timely to explore.

4

CO-OPERATION IN RESEARCH

I. GENERAL DATA OF THE PROBLEM

University teachers being at the same time researchers, most of the developments which were dealt with so far apply equally to them. We cannot, however, completely identify the exchange or teacher mobility problems, on the one hand, and research problems, on the other. It happens, in fact, that university personnel go abroad for missions which are essentially research missions and, moreover, we can often see the intervention in the domain of research of different bodies which are different from those which concern higher education and which have their own policy or their own programmes regarding exchanges, missions abroad, and financing. These bodies can be very diverse : the Fund for the Promotion of Scientific Research *(Fonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung)* in Austria, the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) in France, the National Council for Science and Technology in Romania, the National Academy of Sciences in the United States, for example, and very numerous other academies, learned societies or organizations. These bodies are, of course, interested in the university personnel and grant them missions, but only as researchers.

It should be noted, moreover, that the presence of these bodies makes it difficult sometimes to draw an exact boundary between what is truly interuniversity co-operation and what is only co-operation between university personnel, or university laboratories, in the framework of programmes conceived and managed outside the universities. The French CNRS, for example, collaborates closely with university teachers and issues contracts with university laboratories, but it also has its personnel and its own equipment. It can recruit foreign researchers and it supports "missions abroad", directed or not by a university person, and which function for a period of four years. On the international level, the CERN of Geneva is an intergovernmental body

but which permits many university persons of the member countries to collaborate and to use material in common.

In the socialist countries, a part of the research is assured by the Academies of Science which are often provided with their own personnel and their own laboratories, but which, more and more, co-operate also with universities in their own country (in Bulgaria, especially, there is a high degree of integration between the Academy and the University of Sofia) and possibly, with foreign universities and university persons.

The university dimension properly speaking of organized co-operation in research is thus difficult to isolate precisely. But there is, moreover, the whole field of co-operation which is by definition poorly explorable, and which can be called "unorganized" or "spontaneous" co-operation between researchers. Except in the areas which concern industrial or military secrets — where research develops most often outside the university — scientific investigation is, in a measure much broader than teaching, an international enterprise for which it is perhaps exaggerated to say that it has no boundaries, but where the importance of boundaries is not only contingent or accidental, that is to say, not postulated by the very nature of the activity in question — whereas education, most often, is, explicitly or not, "national". Libraries, journals and documentation centres make available to researchers the works of their colleagues from every country, with whom they thus co-operate unknown even to the interested parties. Even where co-operation implies a more personal communication between partners, it is not necessarily more distinguishable. How to count mutual visits, letters, conversations ? Even more so than in the domain of students or even teachers as such, we must therefore be careful in the evaluation that can be made of university co-operation in the area of research and in the comparisons which we might be tempted to establish between the countries which tend to organize it strongly and those which prefer more flexible and more informal exchanges.

Nonethless, several data remain sure which favour a reinforcement of co-operation :

1. As has been noted, even more so than with teaching, research is an international enterprise which calls for international co-operation.

2. A part of research requires equipment which is more and more sophisticated and costly, which can encourage several universities to join in order to acquire them in common. In a period of inflation and a reduction in credits, this encouragement is all the more strong.

3. If we turn an instant from scientific disciplines as such to consider the problems that they can help to resolve, in terms of which they are posed to contemporary societies, we see that the data and therefore the solution of most of them imply an international dimension. In very many domains, co-operation in research centered on individual disciplines would require to be complemented or extended by co-operation in research centered on problems of an interdisciplinary nature. The answers to the questionnaire do not allow us to say to what point this last type of co-operation has developed, but there is reason to think that in regards to exchanges of researchers as well as common research

programmes, the main accent remains placed on individual disciplines. It is therefore possible that there may be a new field for interuniversity co-operation.

II. EXCHANGE OF RESEARCHERS

As we have already pointed out, it is sometimes difficult to separate exchanges of teachers and exchanges of researchers or of young researchers and advanced students. The German Office of University Exchanges, in the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, does not distinguish between the last two categories in its programmes. However, in the socialist countries, important agreement apparatuses provide also for exchanges of researchers and of student researchers. It is the same in other countries, of Western Europe this time, which indicate that the exchanges of researchers are made mainly in the framework of bilateral or multilateral cultural, economic, scientific, or technical agreements, on the basis of reciprocity ; this is the case with Portugal, for example, with Denmark, and other countries.

In Portugal, these exchanges are financed mainly by the National Institute for Scientific Research, which is a State body, and more accessorily by other organizations, one of which is the Gulbenkian foundation. We find in several other countries central bodies which are mainly charged with research. We have already seen for Austria and for France but in Spain also, for example, that there exists a Higher Education Council for Scientific Research and we find a similar body in Canada. These bodies have varying degrees of autonomy but, in general, they are not only for the role of promoting exchanges of researchers ; they elaborate, propose, or carry out a scientific policy in the framework of which exchanges are organized and financed.

In Finland, it is especially the Ministry of Education (and accessorily the Ministry of Labour) which organizes and finances the exchanges of researchers with foreign countries at an anually fixed rate. In the United Kingdom, there exists not one, but several research councils which participate in the exchanges of researchers, just as the Royal Society which is essentially, as we all know, an academy. We have already pointed out the role of the National Academy of Sciences in the United States, but there exists in the same country, according to its pluralist and decentralized tradition, a multitude of other bodies which are concerned with exchanges of researchers. In Switzerland, a country which itself is also decentralized, there is, nonetheless, a national Fund which organizes exchanges with several countries, among which are the socialist countries.

Finally, several countries offer research grants either to their nationals to go abroad or to foreigners to come to their country without there necessarily being exchange or reciprocity. These grants can be completed with certain facilities in the social, health fields, etc. (Belgium).

We see, then, that the modalities of exchanges of researchers can be very varied, according to the institutional structures and traditions

of the different countries. Perhaps because of this very diversity, however, it is difficult to get an idea, no matter how imprecise, of the volume of exchanges, of the number of persons who take part, and the relative importance of the arrangements concluded directly between universities or university teachers (of which we know, however, that, in the case of Ireland especially, they constitute almost the exclusive form of exchange). It is also difficult to measure the intensity of the flow of exchanges between the different countries of the Region. It is clear, however, that co-operation is high inside the group of socialist countries which know each other well and have concerted programmes or policies as well as comparable structures and administrative procedures. Between the countries of this group and the Western countries, on the contrary, co-operation is generally much more sporadic and dispersed without being nonexistent ; but we can identify, nonetheless, cases of more intense relations, or which are in the process of intensifying. One example for this would be France and Poland. Inside the Western group, co-operation between the Scandinavian countries and the Mediterranean countries is hardly active and, as we have pointed out elsewhere, Norway, for example, co-operates especially, as it seems, with the United Kingdom and the United States. It is normal that privileged relations be established between certain countries, but it seems that there would be room for a diversification of exchanges. The problem is perhaps that in order to co-operate, it is necessary to know each other. An act of co-operation between two countries can thus generate others by a sort of chain effect, but still the process must start up and acquire enough vigour.

What can be said is that it is particularly desirable that researchers and, in particular young researchers, get the opportunity to work in different situations and to obtain multiple impulses in order to seize the problems both in their globality and their diversity and, if possible, to have direct experience with several social or even purely scientific contexts. We must not forget, after all, that one of the great problems of the world today is that of science itself or of the perception of science by the public in a number of countries. The social utilization of knowledge poses henceforth problems of such broadness that the learned community cannot become disinterested in them, even if it is not competent to resolve them all by itself. Parallel to the strictly scientific debate, it is important more than ever to establish a moral, deontological and, finally, philosophical debate on the ends of science, on the responsibility of the researcher, and on the nature of scientific knowledge. A deepening of collective reflection imposes itself in all of these domains, and close contacts between researchers from all horizons are needed. Now, because it unites men from the most diverse disciplines and because it is crossed by all currents of opinion, the university is a framework which is more favourable for such reflexion than any other specialized research institution. This provides an additional reason to hope that an important part of research remains implanted in the university and that the university remains or becomes one of the principal crossroads of the exchange of researchers.

III. JOINT RESEARCH PROGRAMMES

One of the best ways to establish continuing relations between researchers is obviously to give them the opportunity to collaborate on joint projects.

As has already been indicated, certain far reaching joint programmes are promoted by international organizations, in particular by Unesco, and we can believe that all countries of the Region participate in one way or another. These programmes can be of great importance by themselves and they contribute to solidifying the international scientific community. Nonetheless, they constitute only indirectly interuniversity co-operation and that is why we shall not insist upon it here. Among the greatest international achievements in research, nonetheless, a separate place must be made for the University of the United Nations. It is known that it works through a network of institutions or university institutes or university type institutes to which it is linked in various ways and which constitute its principal research apparatus. Its role is thus to engage and actuate, on a certain number of broad problems, concerted research between existant university institutions, most often of national character. It can thus be said that it is an interuniversity co-operation structure in research. Its programmes relate presently to themes such as "Hunger in the World" or the "Utilization of Human and Natural Resources", which interest above all the Third World countries, or at least which present a particular urgency to them. But when the University reaches its full development, it will tackle other problems and will complete its network of co-operating institutions, most especially, it must be hoped, in the Europe Region which collectively has an unequaled research potential at its disposal. One of the benefits of the programmes of the University is that they present a marked interdisciplinary character and besides their own usefulness, they can thus serve as a beginning to other programmes of this type which, perhaps more than traditional programmes centered on a single discipline, need to be stimulated and developed.

Of course, it is not desirable that all research co-operation pass through international organizations. The initiative of national research bodies and universities themselves, elaborating joint programmes in accordance with their scientific choices and their affinities, remains essential. All countries of the Region, moreover, practice this form of co-operation which has witnessed more or less great integration or concertation and sometimes the joint use of equipment. Sometimes, the programmes are fixed regularly by commissions where the universities of two countries (or their national conferences) are represented and which meet regularly to make decisions. In France, this is called integrated action ; such actions were undertaken with Quebec, Spain (32 projects in 1979), and with Poland.

Such actions regularly concerted by governmental or university agencies are equally widely practiced by the socialist countries. The Bielorussian SSR, for example, indicates the existence of 38 joint projects, mainly in the areas of the pure and natural sciences.

The programmes involving the use of heavy equipment seem especially organized and managed by the great research bodies : *Forschungs-*

gemeinschaft and *Max-Planck Gesellschaft* in the Federal Republic of Germany, the Councils of scientific research in the United Kingdom, and the Fund for the promotion of research in Austria, CNRS in France, but they can naturally involve co-operation of university staff. Furthermore, it must be pointed out that the joint use of heavy equipment does not necessarily entail joint programmes ; it can be done equally, by using shared time, for the realization of individual programmes.

If we insist on purely interuniversity co-operation, it is obvious that its prerequisite is a good mutual knowledge of the scientific potential and options of the possible partners. Now, according to the answers to the questionnaire, this knowledge is far from being generally assured for the group of countries of the Region. That is an obstacle which touches particularly the development of joint programmes and which is added to the other obstacles which were mentioned in the preceding sections, linguistic obstacles, legal and administrative obstacles, financial obstacles, etc. As for the last items, it must be added that they are very real now and weigh on the whole of either national or international research. They are not posed perhaps exactly in the same fashion for research as in the other domains, in the measure in which the joint programmes can be a means of realizing economies, especially as concerns the use of equipment ; in this way, the reduction of available credits should instead encourage universities, in certain cases, to pool their means together, and thus to privilege co-operative research.

Still they should know these means. To perfect mutual knowledge of the universities of the Region, we can, of course, envision the constitution of an international documentation centre which would gather and distribute information on their respective resources and scientific orientations. Such a centre would, nonetheless, be extremely difficult to manage and to keep up to date such that it seems preferable, at the present time, to use the existing structures more fully and, for example, where they exist, the national conferences of universities or university heads. That is a formula used, as we have seen, by Spain, France, and Poland. It is also used by Turkey through the intermediary of the Interuniversity Council. Through the intermediary of their conferences the universities can make their projects, their goals, and their means known and joint commissions can be charged to co-ordinate them or to match them and to propose priorities in the framework or not of previous agreements between governments. Thus, relations at the same time continuing and periodically redefined can be established, and we can believe that this mode of co-operation could be more widely developed and even take on in certain cases bilateral or multilateral forms which are more difficult, it is true, to administer.

Nothing appears more worthy of hope, in any case, than a rapprochement of universities and university researchers. More "disinterested" than most other research institutions, universities, once again, are also better placed to reflect on the good and bad uses of science and it is only if they form a close community that they will succeed, at least we can hope, in imposing an intelligent mastery over the great potentialities of knowledge. We can thus only hope that they will unify their efforts and their means.

5

CO-OPERATION IN THE AREA OF DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION

Research nourishes itself on a more and more prodigious quantity of information which it expands and sometimes reorganizes, in its turn. The boundary between co-operation in research and exchanges of scientific information remains, therefore, fuzzy ; the latter could be analysed as a variant and a condition of the former.

To underline the importance of information in our epoch is superfluous. An important part of the activities and human resources is presently devoted to its collection, storage, programming, use, and its diffusion. Due to the very nature of their tasks, universities are obviously taking part in this intense activity, which they were historically among the first to promote. Very early, of course, the apparatus of power and administration accumulated archives for their own ends ; but university institutions played a decisive role in the ordered constitution of document funds which were carriers of knowledge and destined to serve knowledge.

We know, however, to what point, until the invention of the printing press, this enterprise of conservation and accumulation of knowledge was at the same time precarious and persevering. Fires, wars, pillages, periods of carelessness have caused entire sections of intellectual or cultural heritage which were recorded in too few copies on materials which were too weak, to disappear forever. We have not finished trying to find the trace of them, assembling crumbly fragments of papyrus. But, well before us, generations of men were patiently used to conserve what could still be conserved and to find what was lost. We believe today, not without reason, that we devote much of our resources to information and to documentation, but that we also think about these armies of copies who devoted so many laborious days in the monasteries of the European Middle Ages, for example, to the reproduction of manuscripts, that is to say, to the conservation and to the slow enrichment of a threatened patrimony.

I. EXCHANGES BETWEEN LIBRARIES AND LIBRARIANS

The invention of the printing press, surely, has radically changed the situation by permitting the quasi indefinite multiplication of documents.

However, in spite of the great number of titles which appear each year, books, or at least certain books, remain a rare and precarious resource. That is a problem which preoccupies many universities of the Third World where climatic conditions make the conservation of books often still more difficult and which do not succeed in obtaining certain works, certain collections of journals which are no longer on the market. The situation is obviously very different in the majority of countries of Europe which began very early to constitute libraries and archives. Many university libraries are very rich and researchers are able to go to the great central libraries which exist in almost every country if they cannot find the documents which they need in their own university libraries.

Furthermore, exchanges and mutual loans between university libraries are traditional and develop, often on a bilateral basis, in the framework of interuniversity agreements. It seems, however, that there is still room for considerable progress. The economic crisis makes it more and more difficult for each university to acquire the increasing number of works and periodical publications which appear each year in the areas which interest it. A certain pooling of resources thus imposes itself. In order to function well, it requires a good mutual knowledge of the resources of the interested parties and thus, as much as possible, the elaboration of *collective catalogues* permitting easy location of the institution where such and such a document is found. Of course, it is of interest that these catalogues be automated and computerized and that the requests for loans be made rapidly, for example, by telex. Such systems are established at the national level, but they could also be developed between the universities of several countries.

As for exchanges and loans themselves, several techniques facilitate them today, among which are *microfiche* and *microfilm* which not only dispense with the movement of the original documents themselves — which are particularly precious when they have become rare or fragile — but also allow storage in very reduced space. Their production is not very expensive, nor is the acquisition of the reading apparatus which their use requires. Young universities, especially, which often have difficulty in constituting libraries for financial reasons as well as for reasons of the availability of works, can thus have recourse to these. It must be pointed out here that in collaboration with the French CNRS, the Association of Partially or Entirely French Speaking Universities (AUPELF) has created a microfiche and microfilm service for its member universities. Such a service, capable of locating documents and assuring their reproduction, would also be envisionable between European universities or groups of universities. There would perhaps be reason to examine if it would correspond to a need and under what conditions it would be feasible.

In any case, continuing contacts between *librarians* are desirable. More than anyone else, they are familiar with the needs which co-operation could serve to better satisfy and the institutional and technical

possibilities which could therefore be offered in this area. Many countries of the Region organize workshops abroad for their library personnel or receive trainees from other countries and these exchanges are certainly very useful, account taken of bibliotheconomy. In addition to these training workshops, there would perhaps be room for more advanced concentration between university library responsibles, with their principal users, teachers and researchers to establish at least catalogues of what is desirable and possible in the question of co-operation. On the general level, not specifically on the university level, we must point out the important work accomplished by organizations such as the International Federation of Documentation.

Of course, what was said about printed or written documents applies also to the different audio-visual materials — films, cassettes, recordings, etc. — which still occupy a lesser place in traditional teaching but, none the less, play a growing role in it and which are becoming very important in all forms of teaching via television.

II. INFORMATION NETWORKS AND DATA BANKS

We have, until now, kept more or less to traditional exchanges, such as they have been practiced for a long time, even if modern techniques allow them to be lightened and their supports to be diversified. Information science and telematics, the creation of large data banks or bases, however, open up more "revolutionary" perspectives which directly interest the universities, since information is the primary matter of all their activities. With the exception of broad outlines, the writers of the present study lack the technological competence to analyse the possibilities which are offered in this domain. In general, it is a matter of storing the data in the computer then of making it accessible to the users via terminals, of which there exist several types. All of this supposes the establishment of extremely complex infrastructures and technologies, therefore very expensive ; and this is, it must be said, a new factor of inequality in the world. This is why many European countries which have the financial and technical means try to constitute national data bases which permit them to no longer be dependent on the resources of other large countries — for example, the United States, which is very advanced in this domain.

There are, however, obvious limits to this policy, and the United States itself realizes that it must be completed by an internationalization of information networks permitting each partner to have access to the resources of the others, but on equal footing, and at the heart of a system for which it is coresponsible.

On world level, the UNISIST programme of Unesco tries to respond to this need. One of its objectives is precisely to correct the inequalities and to favour the establishment of a new international economic order by assuring the global circulation of information and by encouraging the collaboration between information systems, possibly through the creation of a data bank for the programme itself and capable of facilitating the creation of such systems.

Presently, these collaborations between information systems are put systematically in place, especially at the regional level. It is thus that the socialist countries, essentially the members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), have constituted an International Centre of Scientific and Technical Information consisting of several specialized subsystems and one of the tasks of which is to centralize and to distribute the summaries of research and theses appearing in the member countries as well as articles or translations of scientific articles published in the journals of these countries [1]. Of course, this international centre depends on existing national organizations, certain of which are already extremely developed, especially in the USSR.

On the other hand, the Commission of the European Economic Communities and the postal and telecommunications bodies of the nine member states have signed, at the end of 1975, an agreement for the placement of a telecommunications network to serve as material support for a future European direct information network, the acronym of which is EURONET [2]. We shall not insist here on the complex technology started by this programme and which is described in the article cited in the reference. The EURONET depends or will depend also on national systems, such as the TRANSPAC in France. A similar network, SCANNET, is already in place in the Scandinavian countries. What is important in this study is that the universities and university libraries of interested countries will be able, if they have the financial and material means (terminals, etc.), to benefit from this network. Its common use should, moreover, lead them to collaborate still more closely and to make their practices more uniform.

However, we have the impression that we are only at the beginning of developments which could be very important, but it is too early, at least according to the information at our disposal, to measure their impact on university life. Telematics and the set of communication techniques could very well modify the data of university co-operation in areas which go beyond pure information by permitting, for example, two universities to organize joint seminars without the movement of people.

We must hope that all of the possiblities are explored and used deliberately. What is important to be avoided, once again, is putting aside the most advanced circuit of knowledge, universities or countries which would not have the required technology nor the means to acquire it.

III. DOCUMENTATION CENTRES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

It must be pointed out on this subject that the questions on pedagogy, organization of the educational process, and teaching structures are also the object of exchanges between universities. More and more equally, the data concerning them are collected by documentation

[1] *Unesco Journal for Science and Information, Bibliotheconomy and Archivistic*, vol. 1 no. 3, p. 62. ff., the article of M. B. Arutjunov.

[2] *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries*, vol. XXXI, no. 3, p. 116 ff., the article of H. Vorgerer

centres which serve as relays for exchanges of information. In addition to national bodies which, in many countries of the Region, are charged with improving interuniversity co-operation in the domain of documentation and information (for example, the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries in the United Kingdom, the Universitary Agency of Documentation and Information in France, the Central Federal Office of Printed Material in Switzerland), we see, in fact, international or regional centres of documentation developing which, in the framework of governmental or nongovernmental organizations, specialize in questions relative to policy, organization, and structure of higher education. For the Europe Region of Unesco, the CEPES is a typical example. At a more global level, and still in the Unesco framework, we must cite the services of the International Institute of Educational Planning (Paris) and the Information Centre of the International Bureau of Education (Geneva). Still at the international level, we must also mention the Documentation Centre of the Secretariat of the International Association of Universities which, while originating from a nongovernmental organization, also serves as a "clearing house" to Unesco in matters of higher education. At the level of Western Europe, we must obviously point out the very important documentation work done in the framework of the Council of Europe (EUDISED system), on the other hand, as well as in the framework of the European Economic Communities (Eurydice system). At the nongovernmental level, we must mention the Educational Institute of the European Cultural Foundation in Paris which, as we saw above, played an important role in the institution of common study programmes between universities of the member countries of the EEC.

In the socialist countries, close co-operation is also established in this domain, especially at the level of ministries and institutes of higher education which they have created.

6

CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF UNIVERSITY POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

The preceding paragraphs could well have also been placed under this heading. The information and documentation centres which were briefly in question, in fact, do not constitute ends in themselves but indeed are instruments which certain organizations have created to facilitate co-operation and international or regional concertation in the areas of policy and organization of higher education.

I. POLICY AND DIRECTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Administration and management, in the strict sense, are only a set of methods and procedures to make policy work as efficient as possible. At least it should be thus because, in reality, things are not so simple nor the relations between objectives and means as univocal. Where policy is not clearly formulated or remains hesitant or still proves unrealizable at the present time, the imperatives of management can serve to introduce a policy indirectly or even involuntarily. To take a simple example, there are countries where holders of a high school diploma have the legal or constitutional right of access to university study. Now, it happens that the receiving capacities of the universities are not sufficient to satisfy the application of all those who have the right ; hence, the necessity of instituting a *numerus clausus* imposes itself. In such a case, we can say that the *numerus clausus* constitutes, strictly speaking, a policy — the avowed objective remaining freedom of access — it is only a substitute destined to face difficulties of an administrative order.

In any case, especially in a period of economic crisis, the definition of policies must take the limitation of means and administrative constraints into consideration. The ideal would be that this consideration could be taken clearly and completely, by trying to foresee all of the consequences of the retained choices — which is never entirely possible.

In almost all countries, in any case, governments and universities find themselves confronted with extremely complex problems and, by degrees, hold together on problems which go from the "philosophy" of higher education to the judicious use of square meters. It is normal that each one hopes to exchange ideas and experiences on these subjects.

Governments do it in the framework, of various international organizations (Unesco, Council of Europe, OECD, EEC, Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, etc.) which each one of course calls on the opinions of the members of the university community. Nonetheless, that is only indirectly a question of interuniversity co-operation, which is found, on the contrary, in the pure state at the heart of university associations. Still, an original formula which combines intergovernmental co-operation and interuniversity co-operation must be pointed out. We refer to the joint programme UNESCO-IAU of studies on higher education, a programme directed by a mixed committee in which the two organizations are equally represented and the object of which is to organize studies and international or regional meetings on the great problems of policy, organization, and administration of higher education. Certain work undertaken in the name of the Programme does not interest the Europe Region directly — even though it must obviously be of some interest to other regions — but others include it, as it goes without saying, in their field of investigation : an international study on access to higher education, for example, and another on the methods of teaching and learning in higher education. The last one dating from the activities of the Programme, being prepared with the co-operation of the Programme of the United Nations for the Environment, relates specifically to the Europe Region and aims to define the role of universities in education relative to the environment.

This formula has the explicit goal of facilitating co-operation between governmental and university agencies and presents the originality of being a permanent joint structure between two international organizations from two domains : but it is not the only example, of course, of collaboration between governmental and nongovernmental institutions.

In addition to its documentation activities, the International Association of Universities (IAU), for its part, also has its own programme of studies on university problems. It organizes seminars and round tables whose work serve, in large measure, to prepare debates of its General Conferences. The themes addressed relate to the role of the university in the national and international community as well as to international problems which it must solve in order to accomplish its missions. The IAU is a worldwide organization, and it is naturally led to grant broad attention to the universities in the developing countries ; but it does not neglect the Europe Region which remains the one where the greatest university potential is concentrated and to which, because of this fact, the majority of the 750 members belong. It is, in particular, the only real university organization in the framework of which universities of all countries of Western and Eastern Europe can meet and have dialogues, and it has, in this respect, a unique role of liaison and concertation.

The Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities (CRE) recruits the 320 members in more than twenty countries of Europe, mainly but not exclusively in Western Europe. In addition to its general assemblies which take place every five years and the last of which was held in Helsinki in 1979, it organizes semester conferences which are more limited and devoted to specific problems such as access or research at the university, for example. These semester conferences constitute perhaps the most original aspect of the activities of the CRE. Not only do they constitute a quasi permanent forum of discussion on problems of common interest, but they also permit a frequent and regular renewal of personal contacts between its members and facilitate thus the emergence of a true university confraternity in the countries from which they come.

Among the university associations which are not exclusively European, but which have members in Europe and thus activities which interest certain universities of the Region, we must cite the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), the AUPELF which was already mentioned, and the International Federation of Catholic Universities (IFCU).

All of the organizations cited above are associate members of the IAU and thus have ties between them. Together, they permit a permanent re-examination of the great problems of university policy by the institutions which are directly interested.

II. MANAGEMENT

We have already tried to sketch the reciprocal ties which unite management properly speaking to the choice of directions of university policy. Now, following the extraordinary development of the 50's and 60's, universities have become more and more complex bodies, absorbing an important part of national resources. The problems of management have, since then, acquired a growing weight, still aggravated by the recent crisis. University management has become an affair of professionals and, in many countries, the universities lack administrative executives sufficiently informed in modern methods. As for these methods themselves, a certain indecision, moreover, seems to continue to exist, since the methods which have been elaborated by the great enterprises of the economic sector are not entirely transposable to universities which evidently have a specific character and specific needs, to which it is the attribute of a good management to know how to adapt. There is, thus, room for a more thorough research into the problems of university organization and into the types of training to be given to managers of the university.

We must, moreover, say that considerable efforts have been recently made in this domain.

At the bilateral level, exchanges between administrators from co-operating universities are practically current. At the multilateral level, we note that the responsibles of the administration of the universities of certain groups of countries are in the habit of meeting more or less

regularly to confront their experiences. These consultations and concertations are facilitated when the interested countries have related university traditions and structures, which is the case, for example, with Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland.

But also, at the regional level or subregional level, a certain number of organizations have taken important steps in this area. That goes particularly for the OECD and its Centre for research and innovation in education which launched, a few years ago, a programme relating to management in higher education in which more than one hundred universities from the member countries of the organization participated. It was a rather decentralized programme, articulated in several phases which aimed at taking stock of questions such as modern methods of elaborating budgets, cost-benefit analysis, student orientation, information systems, teaching evaluation methods, decision making procedures, public relations, etc. This programme was of particular importance ; but other organizations have also taken interest in the problem, and the EEC, for example, has organized a seminar for university administrators. The CRE is also interested in the problem of the data processing in management.

In the socialist community of the member countries of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, we find similar preoccupations. Regular conferences of ministers of higher education discuss questions of management at all of their sessions, and commissions of experts meet to study in detail the latest developments in this domain.

On the international level, finally, we must take into account the programmes which Unesco proposes, especially through the intermediary of the International Institute of Educational Planning, which organizes training workshops and seminars on questions of planning and administration.

However, even if important efforts have been made, it seems that progress remains to be made in training a sufficient number of administrators and managers capable of using modern methods and of adapting them to the situation in their own university.

That is perhaps particularly true of the small countries or of those which have fewer resources at their disposal : Bulgaria, for example, Greece, Iceland, Portugal, Turkey. The experience acquired by the large countries could be particularly useful to them, provided that it is adapted, and this is a point on which there would be reason to reinforce co-operation as far as possible.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

We shall not take up again here the several conclusions and suggestions presented in the different chapters of the study. What must be underlined, before ending the study, is that the authors of the answers to the questionnaire were unanimous in believing that interuniversity co-operation carries a particular importance not only for the best accomplishment of tasks, but also for the deepening of mutual comprehension in the world. We can thus hope that governments will consent to sufficient financial efforts to assure their maintenance and development. But the universities themselves must also organize their co-operation in an inventive manner, whereas in many countries they suffer an identity crisis because of their very development and because of the multiplication of their attributions. For whom is the university ? For what is the university ? These two questions condition each other, and we are hardly in agreement as to which one to ask first, nor as to the answer which must be given to each one. Perhaps there is not one sole possible answer, but it is only by recognizing their diversity and their solidarity at the same time and by forming between them a solid community that the universities will succeed most surely in defining themselves and in defining their role — or rather their roles — in society.

ANNEX

ED-79/WS/23
Paris, March 1979
Original : French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE ON INTER-UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

INTRODUCTION

1. In conformity with the wishes expressed by the Advisory Committee of the European Centre for Higher Education at its last three sessions (Bucharest, December 1976, November 1977 and October 1978), and in accordance with the Organization's approved Programme and Budget for 1979—1980, CEPES has undertaken the preparation of a study on inter-university co-operation in Europe which will cover all Member States of the European Region, as it was defined at the 18th and 19th sessions of the General Conference.

2. In addition to the various projects already completed by Unesco in this field, it is to be noted that the final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (Helsinki, 1975) called for intensification of scientific contacts between co-signatory countries. In 1976, the Seminar of European Rectors on the Cultural

and Scientific Aspects of the Helsinki Agreements stressed in its turn the advantages offered by the existing opportunities for scientific co-operation, whilst underlining the need for encouraging new forms of co-operation. To achieve this, a better knowledge and faster acquisition of data concerning the existing forms of co-operation seemed to be essential. Sharing the unanimous opinion of the participants, CEPES, by reason of its mission, was particularly well placed to undertake a systematic study on the situation of inter-university co-operation in Europe ; this also meant that a certain amount of data collected on the occasion of the Second Conference of Ministers of Education of the European Member States (Bucharest, 1973) could be brought up to date.

3. It is not the purpose of such a study to establish an inventory of the agreements or various arrangements that are presently in effect concerning co-operation between European universities, whether bilateral or multilateral. It would seem to be a particularly complex task to assemble the elements required for the elaboration of such a collection and there would be the risk of duplicating certain work that has been done already. Thus, the study will not have an exhaustive and descriptive character but rather will be selective, critical and interpretative. From an analysis of the modalities and problems presented by the application of the various types of inter-university co-operation : bilateral or multilateral intergovernmental agreements, inter-university agreements, various arrangements between departments, faculties, laboratories etc., it will aim at evaluating the diverse experiences as well as the distribution and intensity of exchanges between the various countries of the Region. It will endeavour to bring to light certain shortcomings noted in this respect, to identify those forms of co-operation which seem to be worth developing, as well as the proper means for encouraging the enlargement and intensification of such co-operation.

4. The concrete character of this study explains the reason for and nature of the present questionnaire. The presentation adopted is designed to avoid rigid formulation, thus allowing the many facets of the actual realities and particular administrative or legislative situations to be taken into account. The questions have a purposely open character in order to allow the authors to formulate their replies in accordance with the specific situations and realities of their respective countries. The list of questions is not intended to be exhaustive and the replies may take account of the problems or modalities not mentioned in the questionnaire.

5. The field of investigation covered by this questionnaire deals essentially with the following aspects : forms of co-operation ; student exchanges ; exchanges between teachers ; co-operation in the field of research ; co-operation in the field of university management and administration ; exchanges of documentation, information and educational materials ; evaluation and general recommendations.

6. It should be mentioned, moreover, that for many years Unesco's Office of Statistics has been collecting from Member States a certain amount of data, concerning student mobility, that have been the object of specific studies or published in the corresponding parts of the Organization's Statistical Yearbook. Reference to this kind of data has thus been deliberately left out of the present questionnaire.

7. In view of the character of the information requested, it may be necessary to give the replies in a separate document ; the order of the questions should be respected and their reference numbers incidated. It is also recommended that all available texts and documents that can clarify or complete the information pro-

vided be added to the replies ; lists of any existing bibliographical references should also be annexed.

8. The present questionnaire is sent to you in three copies ; other copies may be mailed to you, at your request, for possible distribution. Would you please send your reply, preferably accompanied by its annexes, as soon as possible, and no later than 30 June 1979, to the following address :

Mr. A. ØFJORD, Director
European Centre for Higher Education
Str. Stirbei Voda, Nr. 39
12-79082 BUCHAREST
ROMANIA

9. In order to enable the Secretariat to request certain clarifications or complementary details, if needed, it would be useful if you could give below the name and address of the individuals or services taking part in preparation of the reply to the questionnaire :

.....

.....

.....

INFORMATION REQUIRED

I. Modalities and geographical distribution of inter-university co-operation

1. Is inter-university co-operation in your country subject to legislative or statutory provisions ? If so, what are they ?
2. What are the main bodies or authorities in your country empowered to conclude agreements or to establish co-operation with foreign universities ?
3. Does there exist in your country a body or authority at national level responsible for the co-ordination of university relations with other countries ?
4. What are the various forms of inter-university co-operation existing between your country and other countries of the European Region regarding :
   - — participation in agreements of multilateral co-operation in the framework of international organizations ;
   - — multilateral or bilateral agreements at governmental level ;
   - — multilateral or bilateral conventions between universities ;
   - — sectorial conventions or understandings between faculties, departments, laboratories or research units ; and
   - — other informal arrangements or provisions for inter-university co-operation ?
5. In your country how important and effective are these various types of agreement ?
6. With which States of the European Region has your country concluded agreements or does it maintain relations of inter-university co-operation ? What are

the main points characterizing the development of this geographical co-operation network over the past five years ?

II. **Student exchanges**

7. During the past few years, what have been the main trends and characteristics of European inter-university co-operation in your country in connection with receiving foreign students, as regards the various countries of origin of these students, the level of studies followed (programmes leading to a first university degree ; programmes leading to a post-graduate degree ; specialization etc.), and the main fields of study ?

8. What provisions are presently in force or being prepared in your country to promote or, if need be, to limit the intake of students coming from other countries of the European Region (regarding, for example, recognition of studies and degrees ; language training ; granting of financial and administrative help ; social acceptance, "numerus clausus" etc.) ?

9. What are the main problems encountered in your country with regard to sending your national students to other countries of the Region ?

10. What are the main obstacles (legal, economic and financial, educational, linguistic, cultural, etc.) to the development of inter-university co-operation in student exchange ? What measures have been taken or are planned in order to overcome these obstacles (for example, legal, administrative and financial measures; educational measures, such as the adoption of joint or integrated programmes of study ; recognition of studies from country to country ; linguistic preparation in the country of origin or host country, and any other measures for receiving students) ?

III. **Exchanges of teaching personnel**

11. Over the past few years, what have been the most pronounced trends of inter-university co-operation in your country as regards receiving foreign teachers from other countries of the European Region (regarding, for example : main countries of origin ; legal arrangements concerning the integration of these teachers into the local teaching corps ; duration of periods of exchange, etc.) ?

12. What are the main obstacles in this respect and the corresponding measures which could be adopted in your country and abroad to encourage mobility of teachers within the European Region ?

13. In your country what arrangements presently exist or are under preparation concerning the opportunities offered to teachers to work abroad (measures for replacement ; arrangements for salary and pensions ; granting of sabbatical leave or exemption from certain professional obligations, etc.) ?

IV. **Co-operation in the field of research**

A. *Exchanges of researchers*

14. What arrangements exist at present or are under preparation in your country concerning :

(a) receiving foreign researchers ;

(b) possibilities offered to your national researchers to start, carry out or participate in research in universities of other countries of the Region ?

15. In your country are there particular arrangements to facilitate and promote exchanges of young researchers, with a view to the pursuit of their training and improvement of their qualifications ?

16. What are the obstacles in your country with respect to exchanges of researchers, and what measures are taken or envisaged, or seem suitable, to overcome these obstacles ?

B. *Co-operation in research programmes*

17. In your country what are the most notable achievements and main trends of inter-university co-operation with regard to research programmes ("heavy" research, governed by agreements at governmental level ; integrated or co-ordinated research programmes between two or more universities of different countries ; equipment and laboratories etc. made jointly available) ?

18. In your country, what are the main obstacles to inter-university co-operation in the field of research programmes, and what measures have been adopted or advocated to promote and improve this type of co-operation ?

V. **Co-operation in the field of university management and administration**

19. In your country are there significant examples of European inter-university co-operation in university management and administration (exchange of ideas, information, personnel, offers or utilization of training opportunities, etc.) ?

20. For your country, what are the main fields where such co-operation seems most useful and what measures have been taken or advocated to achieve better co-operation in these fields ?

VI. **Exchanges of documentation, information and educational material**

21. In your country what are the main measures adopted and the results obtained in inter-university co-operation as regards exchanges between traditional or computerized libraries and documentation centres ; the creation or use of data banks, the granting or obtaining of provisions, financial or other, to facilitate access to modern methods and techniques of information ?

22. Do the universities in your country exchange educational materials with foreign universities ? If so, what types of materials and in what ways ?

23. In your country, what are the principal measures that have been adopted or advocated to increase and improve inter-university co-operation in exchanges of information and documentation ?

VII. **Evaluation and general recommendations**

24. In your country, what major studies and research work have been carried out on problems of inter-university co-operation, either by the appropriate services of the responsible authorities or on an individual basis by specialists ?

25. With regard to your country, what are the most significant results and the major difficulties encountered in carrying out measures to strengthen inter-university co-operation with other countries of the European Region, relating to the different points dealt with in this questionnaire ?

26. What, in your country, are the most noteworthy experiences or innovations achieved in this field ?

27. What are the main objectives in your country in connection with inter-university co-operation for the immediate future ?

VIII. **Are there any particular points not dealt with in the present questionnaire on which you would care to make comments ?**